

64



MEMORANDUM
ON
MAHARASHTRA-MYSORE
BORDER DISPUTE
TO
THE COMMISSION
ON
MAHARASHTRA-MYSORE-KERALA
BOUNDARY DISPUTES
1967

V222/P 1550k 33) 1/6
 K7
 116026

GOVERNMENT OF MAHARASHTRA

**MEMORANDUM ON MAHARASHTRA-MYSORE
BORDER DISPUTE**

PRINTED AT THE GOVERNMENT CENTRAL PRESS, BOMBAY



MEMORANDUM
ON
MAHARASHTRA-MYSORE
BORDER DISPUTE
TO
THE COMMISSION
ON
MAHARASHTRA-MYSORE-KERALA
BOUNDARY DISPUTES
1967

GOVERNMENT OF MAHARASHTRA

No. MMB-2467/BDC,
GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT,
Sachivalaya, Bombay-32-BR,
31st March 1967.

From

Shri D. R. PRADHAN,
Chief Secretary to the Government of Maharashtra,
General Administration Department.

To

The SECRETARY,
Commission on Maharashtra-Mysore-Kerala Boundary
Disputes,
L-1 Block, Central Secretariat, New Delhi-1.

Subject.—Memorandum on the Maharashtra-Mysore
Border Dispute of the Government of
Maharashtra.

Sir,

I have the honour to refer to your letter No. 2/1/66-MC, dated the 25th November 1966, and to send herewith five copies of the Memorandum from the Government of Maharashtra, on the Maharashtra-Mysore Border Dispute with its accompaniments.

Yours faithfully,

D. R. PRADHAN,
Chief Secretary to the Government of Maharashtra.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHAPTER I BACKGROUND AND NATURE OF THE PROBLEM	
Reorganised Bombay State—Territories	1
Mysore State—Territories	1
Effect of Distribution of Territories	2
Submission of Memorandum to the Zonal Council—1957.	2
Four-Man Committee—Appointment of	3
One-Man Commission—Appointment of	3
Purpose of Adjustment	4
Area and Population involved in the Area where Adjustment is to be carried out.	4
CHAPTER II FUNDAMENTAL BASIS	
The Government Resolution of 25th October 1966 ..	6
States Reorganisation since 1905 : East Bengal and Assam—1905.	6
Bengal, Bihar, Orissa and Assam—1912	7
Montague-Chelmsford Report—1918	7
Indian Statutory Commission—1930	7
The Nehru Committee—1928 and Sind—1936	7
The O'Donnell Committee—1931 and Orissa—1936..	8
The Dar Commission—1948	8
The J. V. P. Committee—1949	9
The Andhra Pradesh—1953	10
The States Reorganisation Commission—1953	10
The Principles that emerge	11
The Recommendations of the Commission	12
The States Reorganisation Act, 1956	13
The States of Andhra and Madras	15
The Appointment of Shri H. V. Pataskar—as the Mediator—1956.	15
Transfer of Territories—Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh—1959.	15
The Bombay Reorganisation Act, 1960 and Bifurcation of the Bombay State—the States of Maharashtra and Gujarat.	16
The State of Nagaland Act, 1962,—Separate State of the Naga people.	16
Bihar and Uttar Pradesh—the Arbitration of Shri C. M. Trivedi—1962 and Acceptance of the Recommendations—1965.	16

	PAGE
Reorganisation of the State of Punjab and the Punjab Reorganisation Act, 1966.	17
Discussion of the Basis of Reorganisation of States ..	17
Homogeneity of Language and Culture ..	18
The Unit of Adjustment	19
Wishes of the People	21
Other factors	22
CHAPTER III THE CASE OF THE GOVERNMENT OF MAHARASHTRA	
Principles suggested by the Maharashtra Government.	24
The Village as the Unit	25
The Geographical contiguity	27
The Relative Majority	27
Wishes of the People	27
And its Application in the Past	28
CHAPTER IV MYSORE'S VIEWS	
Reorganisation Final	30
Mysore Chief Minister's Statement	33
Minor Differences	35
Limit of Area for Adjustment	36
Pataskar Formula	37
Census of 1951	39
Maharashtra's Proposals not beneficial to Kannad-speaking people.	40
Exceptions to the Linguistic Principle	42
CHAPTER V KONKANI-MARATHI	
Relation of Marathi-Konkani	43
Konkan and Konkani Language	43
Language and Dialect	44
Definition of Dialects	45
Marathi and its Dialect	45
How Dialects developed and differed from Marathi ..	46
Influence of Marathi and Kannada on Konkani ..	49
Historical Background of Current Konkani ..	49
Marathi, the Literary Language of Konkani ..	52
Konkani, a Dialect of Marathi	54
Views of Local People	58
Konkani is akin to Marathi	58
Limits of Konkani	59
Summary	61

	PAGE
CHAPTER VI INDIVIDUAL AREAS—APPLICATION OF PRINCIPLES	
Areas Claimed	63
Why 1951 Census	67
Areas in the Belgaum District—	
Composition of Belgaum District	69
Area Claimed from Belgaum District	69
Geographical Features	69
Historical Background	70
Fact-Finding Committee's Report	73
Cultural Affinity	74
S.R.C.'s Recommendations	76
Belgaum Taluka Including Belgaum City—	
Wishes of the People	83
Belgaum City	86
Economic Affiliations	87
Weekly Bazaar	88
District Headquarters	88
Marathi Literary Conference of 1929	90
Linguistic Composition	93
Comparison of Balgaum with Bellary	95
Maratha Light Infantry	96
Official Language	97
Municipality of Belgaum	99
General Library and Merchants' Association	100
Age-old Language and Communities	100
Character of City	102
Marathi Periodicals	103
Economic Affinity	104
Language of Agricultural Produce Market Committee.	109
Summary	110
Khanapur Taluka	111
Chikodi and Hukeri Talukas—Nipani Bhag—	
Composition and Topography	114
Historical Background	115
Linguistic Homogeneity	115
Education	116
Common Characteristics	116
Social Structure	117
Economic Affiliations	118
Administrative Aspect	120
People's Hardships	121

	PAGE
Wishes of the People	122
Mysore's Contentions	123
Replies to Mysore's Contentions	124
Mysore Representatives' Arguments	129
Mysore Representatives' Arguments Examined	131
Hukeri and Athni Talukas	135
Karwar-Supa-Haliyal Talukas of North Kanara District—	
Maharashtra Government's claim	136
Details of Areas Claimed	136
Relation of Konkani with Marathi	137
Geographical Contiguity	139
Communications	140
Historical Considerations	141
The Traditional Literacy	144
Periodicals	144
Libraries	145
Records in Marathi	145
Caste Structure	147
Economic Considerations	149
Deficit Area	150
Analogy of Coorg	150
No Reasons given by SRC for Inclusion of this Area in Mysore.	151
Wishes of the People	151
Kalinadi Project	154
Karwar Town	158
Haliyal Taluka	162
Grievances	165
Malnad Tract	165
Areas in Bidar and Gulburga Districts —	
Background	166
Details of Areas Claimed	167
Connections with Maharashtra	168
Hardships	168
People's Wishes	169
Mysore's Contentions	170
Replies to Mysore's Arguments	171
Arguments of Mysore's Representatives on Four-Man Committee.	185
Replies to Mysore's Representative's Arguments	187
Kannad Majority Areas in Maharashtra State	189

CONTENTS

v

APPENDICES—	PAGE
APPENDIX I—Maps	191
APPENDIX II—Resolutions of the Government of India and Maharashtra State Legislature.	192
APPENDIX III—Correspondence and Resolutions of the Government of Bombay.	199
APPENDIX IV—Statement showing Linguistic Composition of Villages and Towns claimed by the Government of Maharashtra.	204
APPENDIX V—Nature of Hardships of the Marathi-speaking People in the Border Areas in Mysore.	244
APPENDIX VI—	
(1) Statement showing Nakawise Collections on account of Octroi Duties in the Belgaum Municipal Limits.	246
(2) Statement showing the Imports of Jaggery, Tobacco, etc. into the Nipani Municipal area.	250
APPENDIX VII—Letter dated 3rd May 1956 from the Chief Minister of the Hyderabad State to the Union Home Minister.	255

BACKGROUND AND NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

I. BACKGROUND

Territories of Reorganised Bombay State

The State of Bombay was reorganised and the State of Mysore was constituted under the States Reorganisation Act, 1956 (XXXVII of 1956). The Bombay State so reorganised comprised the following territories:—

- (a) the territories of the former State of Bombay excluding—
 - (i) Bijapur, Dharwar and Kanara districts and Belgaum district except Chandgad taluka, and
 - (ii) Abu Road taluka of Banaskantha district;
- (b) Aurangabad, Parbhani, Bhir and Osmanabad districts, Ahmedpur, Nilanga and Udgir talukas of Bidar district, Nanded district (except Bichkonda and Jukkal circles of Deglur taluka and Mudhol, Bhiansa and Kuber circles of Mudhol taluka), and Islapur circle of Boath taluka, Kinwat taluka and Rajura taluka of the Adilabad district in the former State of Hyderabad;
- (c) Buldana, Akola, Amravati, Yeotmal, Wardha, Nagpur, Bhandara and Chanda districts in the former State of Madhya Pradesh;
- (d) the territories of the former State of Saurashtra; and
- (e) the territories of the former State of Kutch.

Territories of Mysore State

1.2. The State of Mysore consists of the following territories:—

- (a) the territories of the former State of Mysore;
- (b) Belgaum district except Chandgad taluka and Bijapur, Dharwar and Kanara districts in the former State of Bombay;

- (c) Gulbarga district except Kodangal and Tandur talukas
Raichur district except Alampur and Gadwal talukas and
Bidar district except Ahmedpur, Nilanga and Udgir talukas,
Zahirabad taluka (except Nirna circle), Nyalkal circle of
Bidar taluka and Narayankhed taluka;
- (d) South Kanara district except Kasaragod taluka and
Amindivi Islands and Kollegal taluka of Coimbatore
district in the former State of Madras; and
- (e) the territories of the former State of Coorg.

Effect of Distribution of Territories

1.3. The effect of the distribution of territories between the States of Bombay and Mysore was that some areas having a preponderance of Marathi-speaking people, though contiguous to the Bombay State (Maharashtra), came to be included in the Mysore State and likewise some areas having a preponderance of Kannad-speaking people, though contiguous to the Mysore State, were included in Maharashtra. This resulted in leaving very large linguistic minorities in the two States which could and should have been avoided. However, a specific provision has been made in section 21 (2) (b) of the States Reorganisation Act empowering the Zonal Councils to discuss and make recommendations with regard *inter-alia* to any matter concerning linguistic minorities and even border disputes. Thus the two States came into being without achieving the linguistic homogeneity to the maximum extent possible and left the question of border adjustments to the Zonal Councils.

Submission of Memorandum and Zonal Council

1.4. Realising the plight of the Marathi-speaking linguistic minority on the border, the then Government of Bombay soon after the formation of the new States, invoked the provisions of section 21 (2) (b) of the States Reorganisation Act and submitted a memorandum in June 1957 to the Government of India, making proposals for readjusting very early the boundary between the two States on a rational basis. The subject was placed on the agenda of the first meeting of the Western Zonal Council in

September 1957 but was not taken up. Even in the second meeting of the Western Zonal Council held in December 1958, its consideration was deferred. The composition of the Western Zonal Council underwent a change with the bifurcation of the Reorganised Bombay State into the States of Maharashtra and Gujarat by the Bombay Reorganisation Act, 1960 (11 of 1960). The States of Mysore and Bombay, which were till then the members of the Western Zonal Council, became members of two different Zonal Councils. However, the boundary dispute did not come up before either of the Zonal Councils.

Four-Man Committee

1.5. In 1960, the two Chief Ministers agreed to constitute a Four-Man Committee, consisting of two representatives of each Government. The four representatives were to study and discuss together, in detail, the cases put forward by the two Governments regarding the disputed border between the two States and report to the two Governments the areas of agreement and disagreement about the disputed border with reasons therefor. The representatives of the two Governments, however, failed to reach an agreement and submitted two separate reports to their respective Governments.

Appointment of One-Man Commission

1.6. During all this period, the matter was being continually raised in various forums including the Legislatures of the two States. The Legislatures of the reorganised Bombay State and Maharashtra State passed unanimous resolutions on the 11th March 1960 and the 5th April 1966 respectively, urging immediate transfer of the Marathi-speaking areas in the Mysore State to the Maharashtra State (Appendix II—5 and 6). The Marathi-speaking people in the disputed border areas in the Mysore State also demonstrated by all democratic means their desire to be included in the then Bombay (Maharashtra) State. After the failure of the Four-Man Committee to find out a solution, the Government of Maharashtra requested the Government of India to take early steps to settle the border question. Ultimately, in the All India Congress Committee meeting held at Bangalore in July 1965, a resolution was passed for setting up an appropriate

machinery to solve inter-State disputes. However, such a machinery could not be set up to settle the Maharashtra-Mysore boundary dispute due to the Indo-Pakistan conflict. Finally, the Government of India announced the appointment of the present One-Man Commission on the 25th October 1966.

II. THE NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

Purpose of Adjustment

1.7. The States of Mysore and Maharashtra have already come into being and the present problem relates to the appropriate readjustment of the boundary between the two States, so as to bring together the maximum number of people speaking the same language. It is a matter which the States Reorganisation Act left to be settled through the Zonal Council and has now been referred to the present Commission. To complete the task of reorganisation thus left incomplete by the States Reorganisation Act, the Marathi and Kannad-speaking people will have to be put in their appropriate States so that linguistic homogeneity could be achieved to the maximum extent and their inconveniences and hardships are reduced to the minimum. This will necessarily involve transfer of territories although that is not the real aim of the present task.

Area and population involved

1.8. The area involved stretches along the entire border between the States of Maharashtra and Mysore. For the sake of convenience, it can be divided into the following sections :—

- (1) the area falling in the Belgaum and Khanapur talukas including the towns of Belgaum and Khanapur;
- (2) the area falling in Chikodi taluka including Nipani town and about 50 villages known as Nipani Bhag surrounding it, and some villages in the talukas of Hukeri and Athni;
- (3) the area falling in the talukas of Karwar (including the town of Karwar) Haliyal and Supa;
- (4) the area falling in the Humnabad, Bhalki and Santpur talukas of the Bidar district, and in the Aland taluka of the Gulbarga district;

- (5) the area falling in the Akkalkot, South Sholapur and Mangalwedha talukas of the Sholapur district;
- (6) the area falling in the Jath taluka of the South Satara (now Sangli) district; and
- (7) the area falling in the Shirol and Gadhinglaj talukas of the Kolhapur district.

The first four are predominantly Marathi-speaking areas in the Mysore State and the latter three are predominantly Kannad-speaking areas in the Maharashtra State (Appendix I, Map No. 1).

1.9. The total number of villages and towns involved is about 1,076. The towns include the Belgaum city, Karwar and Nipani. Of these, about 816 villages and towns are proposed for transfer to the Maharashtra State from the Mysore State and about 260 are proposed to be transferred to the Mysore State from the Maharashtra State (Appendix I, Map Nos. 1 and 2).

1.10. The total population in this area according to the 1951 Census is about 10 lakhs of which about 6.75 lakhs are in the first four areas in the Mysore State and about 3.25 lakhs in the latter three areas in the Maharashtra State.



II

FUNDAMENTAL BASIS

The resolution of the Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs, No. F.38/13/66-SR, dated the 25th October 1966 (Appendix II-1), appointing this Commission leaves no doubt that the Government of India recognise that a border dispute exists between the States of Maharashtra and Mysore and that in their view it should be solved. It is also clear from the resolution that the Government of India desire that in recommending a solution, the Commission should take into consideration, the fundamental basis of the reorganisation of States in India and the opinion of the people concerned.

2.2. Since the time the problem cropped up owing to the formation of the States of Bombay (Maharashtra) and Mysore under the States Reorganisation Act, 1956 (XXXVII of 1956), the Government of Maharashtra (Bombay) and the Marathi-speaking people in the disputed areas of the Mysore State have been representing to the Government of India that the question of demarcation of boundaries between the States of Bombay (Maharashtra) and Mysore should be settled early on rational and just principles.

East Bengal and Assam

2.3. The process of evolution generated by historical forces has been instrumental in bringing about the reorganisation of States in India. The beginning of this process may be seen in the early years of this century, when the Province of Eastern Bengal and Assam was constituted in October 1905 by a Proclamation by the Governor General of India comprising the territories under the administrative control of the Chief Commissioner of Assam and certain districts forming part of the Bengal Division of the Presidency of Fort William. By the same Proclamation, the Governor General declared that the district of Sambalpur (except

the Chandrapur-Padampur Zamindari and the Phuljhar Zamindari) forming part of the Central Provinces was included in the Bengal Division of the Presidency of Fort William. Although the new province of East Bengal and Assam was created on political grounds, the linguistic principle was mentioned in support of transfer of certain Oriya-speaking tract from the Central Provinces to Bengal.

Bengal, Bihar and Orissa and Assam

2.4. Seven years later, the partition of Bengal was annulled and the new Provinces of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa and Assam were constituted by the Bengal, Bihar and Orissa and Assam Laws Act, 1912 (7 of 1912). It appears from the provisions of Schedules A, B and C to this Act, that except in the case of Orissa, the redistribution of Provinces was made on the basis of language, and the boundaries of the Provinces were fixed on the basis of the boundaries of the existing districts.

Montague-Chelmsford Report

2.5. In paragraph 246 of the Montague Chelmsford Report (1918), which laid the foundation for the dyarchical form of Government in the Provinces of British India, it was conceded that the business of Government would be simplified if administrative units were both smaller and more homogeneous and the business of legislation would be facilitated if it was conducted in the regional language.

Indian Statutory Commission

2.6. The Indian Statutory Commission in paragraph 38 of the Volum II of their Report (1930) also expressed the view that the use of a common speech was a strong and rational basis for provincial individualism.

Sind

2.7. The Nehru Committee (1928), which examined the question of redistribution of provinces, recognised that the argument for the separation of Sind was very strong on the grounds that it was a definite linguistic area and the great majority of the people demanded separation. In 1936, Sind was separated from the

Presidency of Bombay and formed into a Province under the provisions of the Government of India Act, 1935. Although this was done on political grounds, the linguistic homogeneity and wishes of the people were taken into account.

Orissa

2.8. The O'Donnell Committee, which was appointed by the Government of India in 1931, to examine and report on the administrative, financial and other consequences of setting up a separate administration for the Oriya-speaking people, took language into consideration with other factors and observed in paragraph 6 of Volume I of its report that primary importance should be given to the wishes of the people if they could be clearly ascertained. The Province of Orissa was created in 1936 under the provisions of the Government of India Act, 1935 by joining together the Oriya-speaking areas of the Provinces of Bihar and Orissa, the Central Provinces and Madras. The boundaries of the Province of Orissa with the adjoining Provinces of Bihar, Central Provinces and Madras were fixed by the Government of India (Constitution of Orissa) Order in March 1936 on the basis of the boundaries of the existing districts, talukas, villages and zamindari estates *vide* Parts I and II of the first Schedule to the Order. Thus, in this case the following three principles were taken into account, viz. (1) linguistic homogeneity, (2) wishes of the people and (3) village as the lowest unit.

Dar Commission

2.9. After India became independent, a Linguistic Provinces Commission known as the Dar Commission was appointed by the President of the Constituent Assembly of India in June 1948 to examine and report on the formation of new Provinces of Andhra, Karnataka, Kerala and Maharashtra and on the administrative, financial and other consequences of the creation of such new Provinces. The Commission submitted its report in December 1948. As a result of the following conclusions which it reached in para 152 of its report no steps were taken for the creation of the proposed provinces :—

- (i) The formation of Provinces on exclusively or even mainly linguistic considerations is not in the larger interests of the Indian nation and should not be taken in hand.

- (ii) In the formation of new Provinces, whenever such a work is taken in hand, oneness of language may be one of the factors to be taken into consideration along with others ; but it should not be the decisive or even the main factor. Generally speaking, bilingual districts in border areas which have developed an economic and organic life of their own, should not be broken up and should be disposed of on consideration of their own special needs. Similarly the cities of Bombay and Madras should receive special treatment and be disposed of in the best interests of India as a whole and in their own interests. Subject to the above and other relevant and paramount considerations, if some new Provinces come into being and produce more or less linguistic homogeneity they need not be objected to.
- (iii) No new Provinces out of those referred to it should be created for the present.

Thus although the Commission was against the creation of new provinces out of the then existing provinces viz. Madras, Bombay and Central Provinces, it had to concede oneness of language as one of the factors to be taken into account in the reorganisation of provinces. It also suggested district as the unit for such reorganisation.

J. V. P. Committee

2.10. The J. V. P. Committee appointed by the Indian National Congress, which reported in 1949, generally concurred with the views expressed by the Dar Commission. The Committee, however, admitted in the penultimate paragraph of its report that if public sentiment was insistent and overwhelming, it would have to submit to it subject to certain limitations in regard to the good of India as a whole and other conditions specified by it.

2.11. The Governor General of India on the 25th January 1950, issued orders transferring enclaves from some Provinces to princely States and *vice versa*. This was done avowedly to achieve geographical contiguity.

Andhra Pradesh

2.12. Although the report of the Dar Commission was accepted and the demand for creation of linguistic provinces was rejected, a reversal of policy in favour of linguistic provinces took place after the death of Shri Potti Sriramulu, when the Prime Minister of India made a statement in the Parliament on the 19th December 1952, that the Government of India had decided to establish an Andhra State consisting of the Telugu-speaking areas out of the present State of Madras. In March 1953 he made an announcement in the Parliament about the formation of the new State of Andhra. He then stated that as it was desirable that the new State should be formed as early as possible and the work of fixing the exact boundary through a Boundary Commission might take considerable time, the new State should be formed on the basis of the existing boundaries of the districts except in the case of the Bellary district where the Telugu majority talukas of Arvi, Alur and Rayadurg should be included in the proposed State of Andhra ; further a Boundary Commission or Commissions would be appointed some time after the establishment of the Andhra State to determine the exact boundaries of the State and to recommend such adjustments as might be considered necessary in regard to the boundaries of that State with the residuary States of Madras and the Mysore State. On the 1st October 1953, the Andhra State came into existence in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the Andhra State Act, 1953 (30 of 1953). The principles followed in this case thus were (1) wishes of the people, (2) linguistic homogeneity, (3) district as a unit for rough demarcation of the boundary and (4) detailed demarcation of the boundary subsequently, obviously on the basis of a unit lower than the district.

States Reorganisation Commission

2.13. After the State of Andhra had been formed in 1953, the Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs, by their resolution No. 53/69/53-Public, dated the 29th December 1953 (Appendix II-3) appointed a Commission known as the States Reorganisation Commission to examine carefully the whole question of the re-organisation of the States of the Indian Union and after taking into consideration the recommendations made by this Commission,

the States Reorganisation Act was passed by the Parliament in 1956. The relevant extract from the Government Resolution mentioned above is reproduced so that the fundamental basis of the reorganisation of the States of India could be understood in its proper perspective in the context of the States Reorganisation Act (XXXVII of 1956) and the subsequent Acts passed by the Parliament referred to in the succeeding paragraphs :

“ The greater development of political consciousness among the people and the growing importance of the great regional languages led gradually to demands for the formation of certain States on a linguistic basis.”

* * * * *

“ The language and culture of an area have an undoubted importance as they represent a pattern of living which is common in that area. In considering a reorganisation of States, however, there are other important factors which have also to be borne in mind. The first essential consideration is the preservation and strengthening of the unity and security of India. Financial, economic and administrative considerations are almost equally important, not only from the point of view of each State, but for the whole nation.”

* * * * *

“ The whole question of the reorganisation of the States of the Indian Union should be carefully examined, objectively and dispassionately, so that the welfare of the people of each constituent unit, as well as of the nation as a whole, is promoted.”

The States Reorganisation Commission has discussed the above points in Chapter I of Part II of its report. The Commission has stated in paragraph 93 of Chapter I that the principles that emerge may be enumerated as follows :—

- “ (i) Preservation and strengthening of the unity and security of India ;
- (ii) linguistic and cultural homogeneity ;

- (iii) financial, economic and administrative considerations;
and
(iv) successful working of the national plan.”

In Chapter III the Commission has dwelt at some length on the question of language and culture and set out the case for linguistic States as well as the case against linguistic States and summarised its views on the role of language as a factor bearing on the reorganisation of the States as under:—

“After a full consideration of the problems in all its aspects, we have come to the conclusion that it is neither possible nor desirable to reorganise States on the basis of the single test of either language or culture, but that a balanced approach to the whole problem is necessary in the interests of our national unity.” (Paragraph 162 of the S. R. C. Report).

The Commission has thereafter indicated what a balanced approach would appear to be. The first step of this approach would be :—

“to recognise linguistic homogeneity as an important factor conducive to administrative convenience and efficiency but not to consider it as an exclusive and binding principle, over-riding all other considerations, administrative, financial or political ;” (Paragraph 163 (a) of the S. R. C. Report).

It may be noted that the Commission has here almost equated linguistic homogeneity with administrative convenience and efficiency. Here we find echoes of the principles conceded in the Montague Chelmsford Report referred to in paragraph 2.5 above. The States Reorganisation Commission has also mentioned other factors in Chapter III. In paragraph 221 it has observed that the wishes of the people to the extent they are objectively ascertainable and do not come into conflict with larger national interests should be an important consideration in readjusting the territories of the States.

There are several observations made by the States Reorganisation Commission in its report which go to show that linguistic affinity was considered by it as a vital factor for reorganisation of the

States. If the report is studied carefully, it will be found that by and large, the reorganisation of the States has been recommended with a view to bringing together the people speaking the same language. This is evident from its recommendation in regard to the formation of the States of Karnatak and Kerala and the breaking up of the Hyderabad State and attaching the predominantly Marathi-speaking areas to the Bombay (Maharashtra) State, the predominantly Kannada-speaking areas to the Karnatak (Mysore) State and the formation of a Hyderabad State consisting of the predominantly Telugu-speaking areas from the princely State of Hyderabad with an option to it to merge with the Andhra State subsequently. It is also clear from its report that it was on account of the Bombay City that it did not recommend the breaking up of the Bombay State into the States of Maharashtra and Gujarat. In the case of the Punjab State, the Commission did not recommend a separate State of the Punjabi-speaking people on the ground that such a State would not solve the language problem nor the communal problem and far from removing internal tension which existed between communal, linguistic and regional groups, it might further exacerbate the existing feelings.

After examination of the principles suggested for solution of the problem of reorganisation, the Commission in paragraph 235 of its report expressed itself against a monistic approach and decided to examine each case of its own merits and in its own context after taking into consideration the totality of circumstances and an overall assessment of the solutions proposed. In applying the principle of linguistic and cultural homogeneity, it adopted the principle of relative majority with district as the unit. It insisted on 70 per cent majority of a language group in a taluka for detaching it from the district having a majority of a different language group.

Although the demarcation of boundaries between the reorganised States recommended by the States Reorganisation Commission was made more or less on the basis of the boundaries of the existing districts, there were cases in which the Commission recommended territorial adjustments on the basis of a unit smaller than a district. The States Reorganisation Act passed by the Parliament on the 31st August 1956 specifies the territories of the various

States, which include transfers of territories comprising talukas or portions of talukas from one State to another. Further the recommendations of the Commission show that circumstances other than linguistic homogeneity did not weigh with it much in actual practice. For, all the States except Bombay and Punjab recommended by it were linguistically homogeneous.

It must be mentioned here that the Government of India did not accept all the recommendations made by the States Reorganisation Commission. The late Shri G. B. Pant, Minister for Home Affairs, stated in the Parliament on the 26th April 1956 in the course of the debate on the States Reorganisation Bill as under :—

“ We have attached considerable weight to the recommendations of the Commission and as the honourable Members may be remembering we had made every effort to keep the country to the extent it was possible in a receptive mood on the eve of the publication of the report of the Commission. It was our endeavour that the recommendations might be received with sympathy and respect. But we could not abdicate our function. While we were throughout persuading the people to be prepared for a cordial reception of the recommendations, we had to take account of the public opinion and see that the final decisions were made with the general approval of the people concerned and of the community at large. So certain changes had to be made. I would like those who were of the opinion that the proposals of the Commission should have been accepted as they were, to see whether the position today would have been better or worse if those recommendations had been bodily incorporated in the Bill.”

The recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission in regard to the creation of Vidarbha and Telangana as separate States and the transfer of a portion of the Bellary district which had already been included in the Mysore State, to the State of Andhra were not accepted by the Government of India and the Parliament. There were also other recommendations made by the Commission which were not accepted by the Government of India and the Parliament.

Andhra and Madras

2.14. A reference has already been made to the Prime Minister's assurance at the time of formation of the Andhra State that a boundary Commission or Commissions would be appointed for the detailed demarcation of the boundary. However, no such Commission was appointed. On the assumption that the border dispute between the States of Andhra and Madras might be settled satisfactorily by negotiation, the States Reorganisation Commission did not make any particular recommendation in regard to it. The boundary dispute was eventually referred to Shri H. V. Pataskar in December 1956 for his mediation and on the basis of his report, the Andhra Pradesh and Madras (Alteration of Boundaries) Act (56 of 1959), was passed by the Parliament in December 1959, transferring 318 villages from the State of Andhra Pradesh to the State of Madras and 151 villages from the State of Madras to the State of Andhra Pradesh. The broad principles on which the readjustment of the boundaries between the two States was made were (1) the boundary line should be continuous and isolated pockets should be avoided, (2) the village should be the unit for consideration, (3) villages with over 50 per cent. Telugu-speaking people should be incorporated in the State of Andhra Pradesh and those with over 50 per cent Tamil-speaking people should be included in the State of Madras and (4) due consideration should be given to geographical features such as hills, forests and rivers as constituting natural boundaries between the two States and to economic features such as irrigation sources and their ayacuts being in the same State. The last principle was, however, not allowed to override all or any of the other three principles.

Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh

2.15. In September 1959, the Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh (Transfer of Territories) Act (47 of 1959), was passed by the Parliament under which certain areas from three villages in the Bhensrorgarh tehsil of the Chittore district were transferred from the State of Rajasthan to the State of Madhya Pradesh. In this particular case, not only a village but portions of village were transferred from one State to another.

Maharashtra and Gujarat

2.16. In April 1960, the Bombay Reorganisation Act (11 of 1960), was passed by the Parliament bifurcating the Bombay State into the States of Maharashtra and Gujarat. Under this Act, several villages from the Umbergaon taluka of the Thana district and the Nawapur, Nandurbar and Akkalkuwa talukas of the West Khandesh district were transferred to the State of Gujarat by mutual agreement. The principles followed in the reorganisation of the bilingual Bombay State were (1) linguistic homogeneity, (2) wishes of the people, and (3) village as the lowest unit.

Nagaland

2.17. In September 1962, the State of Nagaland Act (27 of 1962), was passed by the Parliament under which territories comprising the district of Kohima and the Tunensang Frontier Division of the North East Frontier Agency were transferred from the State of Assam to the State of Nagaland. Here a separate State of the Naga people as distinct from the Assamese was created and the unit adopted was smaller than a district, namely a sub-division.

Bihar and Uttar Pradesh

2.18. In May 1962, the Prime Minister of India referred the dispute between the States of Bihar and Uttar Pradesh, in regard to the boundaries of the districts of Shahabad and Saran in Bihar and Ballia in Uttar Pradesh, which were varying from time to time according to the variations in the deep streams of the rivers Ganges and Ghaghra, to the arbitration of Shri C. M. Trivedi. On the 16th October 1965, the Prime Minister of India accepted all the recommendations made by Shri C. M. Trivedi in his report (1964). In this case, village was adopted as the unit and the wishes of the people of each village were taken as the deciding factor except in the case of one village out of 192 villages. This was not a case of linguistic dispute because the language was the same in both the States. It is a case of transfer of territory and incidentally of population on account of the vagaries of rivers over which man has no control and not a case of transfer of people and incidentally of territory on account of a linguistic dispute or the linguistic aspirations of the people.

Punjab and Haryana

2.19. In April 1966, the Government of India decided to reorganise the State of Punjab on linguistic basis so as to constitute from its territories two States, namely Punjab and Haryana, after transferring to Himachal Pradesh such of the hill areas particularly of the Hindi region of the State as were contiguous to that Union Territory and had cultural and linguistic affinities with it. A Commission was, therefore, appointed by the Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs, by their resolution No. F. 17/7/66/SR, dated the 23rd April 1966 (Appendix II-4), to examine the existing boundary of the Hindi and Punjabi regions of the then State of Punjab and to recommend what adjustments, if any, were necessary in that boundary to secure the linguistic homogeneity of the proposed Punjab and Haryana States. The Commission was also asked to take into account such other factors as administrative convenience and economic well being, geographic contiguity and facility of communication and to ordinarily ensure that adjustments that might be recommended did not involve breaking up of the existing tehsils.

The Commission recommended that the adjustments of the boundaries of the States of Punjab and Haryana and Himachal Pradesh should be made according to the division of territory as set out by it. In September 1966, the Punjab Reorganisation Act (31 of 1966), was passed by the Parliament by which the State of Haryana was carved out of the State of Punjab. The adjustment of boundaries between the Punjab and Haryana States and the Union Territory of Chandigarh was made on the basis of areas smaller than a district. In some cases, even villages or portions of villages were transferred from the State of Punjab to the State of Haryana and the Union Territory of Chandigarh.

Thus the principles followed in this case were (1) linguistic and cultural affinity, (2) geographical contiguity, (3) wishes of the people, and (4) tehsil as the unit ordinarily but not invariably.

Fundamental basis of reorganisation of States

2.20. The foregoing recital of the history of this question reveals certain broad features to which attention may now be

called. In the first instance, in the pre-independence period, the progress of transfer of power to Indians and towards democratisation was closely related to recognition of the need for the formation of unilingual provinces. What was involved in the process was fully brought out in the formation of the province of Orissa in 1936. Indian political parties were also fully committed to the formation of provinces on a linguistic basis. This is evidenced by the report of the Nehru Committee (1928).

2.21. After independence, there was a temporary set-back in the acceptance of this principle as it was apprehended that the process of reorganisation of the States on linguistic basis might lead to encouragement of the forces of disintegration. This phase is represented by the report of the Dar Commission and the J. V. P. Committee. The phase lasted for only a short time as basic political forces proved too strong for it. Beginning with the formation of the Andhra State in 1953, a series of steps had to be taken which led to a radical reorganisation of the States in India. Unfortunately, this reorganisation did not take place with the initial acceptance of a set of principles for the formation of States and for the delimitation of their boundaries which were then consistently applied, rather, it came about through a series of hesitant and halting decisions taken under pressure of circumstances. Consequently, it is not possible to find the fundamental basis of the reorganisation of the States during the last fifteen years in India fully and adequately formulated in any one statement or document. The basis has to be derived from the trends that can be seen in the successive pieces of legislation in this regard.

2.22. In discussing the characteristics of the fundamental basis from a chronological study of relevant legislation, two aspects demand special attention. Firstly, the importance of the linguistic criterion and secondly the unit of territory in relation to which delimitation of boundaries is made.

2.23. Progressive acceptance of the principle of homogeneity of language and culture as the almost sole criterion for the reorganisation of the States is fully evident from legislative history. Outside the Hindi-speaking area, what has been achieved during the last

fifteen years is not only the formation of unilingual States but also a single State for each such linguistic group. All considerations and proposals which went counter to this trend have been swept aside in the course of history. It is instructive to follow, in this regard, the fate of the recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission which deviated from these principles. The States Reorganisation Commission recommended the creation of a separate State of Telangana, the constitution of a separate Vidarbha and the creation of a Bombay State specially constituted so as to avoid tackling the problem of the Bombay City. It also opposed the partition, on a linguistic basis of the State of Punjab. These were the main recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission deviating from the principles indicated above; in all other cases, in recommending formation of the States, the Commission followed the linguistic principle. The recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission regarding Telangana and Vidarbha were not accepted by the Parliament and in relation to Bombay, they departed from the linguistic principle by creating a bilingual State of speakers of Marathi and Gujarati. The last arrangement, however, proved short-lived and in 1960, the formation of the States of Maharashtra and Gujarat further established the principle of the reorganisation of the States so as to form single, unilingual States outside the Hindi-speaking area. The only exception to this principle that still remained was that of the State of Punjab. In 1966, this was also removed and the linguistic principle was explicitly accepted in the formation of the new States which were created by the partition of the Punjab. It can thus be stated without any fear of contradiction that outside the Hindi-speaking area, the fundamental basis of the reorganisation of the States has been the formation of single, unilingual States.

Unit of Adjustment

2.24. As regards the unit of territory in relation to which boundaries of reorganised States should be fixed, the earliest practice was to go down to the village. This is exemplified by the manner in which boundaries between Orissa and Madras were

delimited in 1936. When in 1953, the post-independence reorganization of States began, though the initial legislation was based mostly on district boundaries, this was accompanied by the announcement that a Boundary Commission would in due course, delimit the boundaries in detail. Although the States Reorganisation Commission argued in favour of adopting the district as the basis of delimitation of the States, it departed from it in numerous cases and adopted in good many cases the taluka and in one or two cases even the sub-tehsil and the Thana units. All area units, including the lowest revenue units, have, during the hundred years, been subject to change and there is no evidence for holding that any such unit has developed any special organic, administrative or economic unity of its own which will suffer because of a delimitation of boundary by villages. This view is sustained by the course of events which have led the Parliament to adopt lower and lower units in fixing boundaries in legislation during the last ten years. Since 1956, three major Acts have been passed which contain provisions regarding fixation of boundaries between linguistic States. These are: (1) the Andhra Pradesh and Madras Act of 1959 (56 of 1959), (2) the Bombay Reorganisation Act of 1960 (11 of 1960), and (3) the Punjab Reorganisation Act of 1966 (31 of 1966). In each of these, the village has been adopted as the lowest unit for delimiting boundaries in one context or another. The entire demarcation of the boundary between the Andhra and Madras States was carried out with the help of village census slips. The Bombay Reorganisation Act of 1960 involved the drawing up of boundaries between the two new linguistic States of Gujarat and Maharashtra. The border districts involved were mainly Thana and West Khandesh in Maharashtra and Surat and Broach in Gujarat. The Act defined the boundary between the two new States by naming villages in each of the border talukas in Thana and West Khandesh and adding them to the relevant border talukas in Surat and Broach. The adjustment of boundaries between the newly created States of the Punjab and Haryana and those between these two and the Himachal Pradesh was entrusted to a Commission which was directed to ensure ordinarily that the adjustments did not involve breaking of the existing tehsils. Even so, the Commission found it necessary

to go down to much lower units in each case. The first three Schedules to the Punjab Reorganisation Act, 1966 (31 of 1966), bring this out. In the adjustment of boundaries between the Punjab and Haryana the lowest unit referred to was that of the Patwari circle; and between Punjab and Chandigarh the definition of boundaries was made often in terms of villages and this was also the case regarding the adjustment of boundary between the Punjab and Himachal Pradesh.

2.25. It is thus clear that any unit above the village does not provide a generally satisfactory basis for the adjustment of boundaries between reorganised States. There is no justification for insisting on maintaining a larger unit intact in this delimitation particularly because very often such units are the result of political history or ununiform application of certain administrative standards. None of these have any significance in administrative, political or economic terms and the proper definition of boundaries ought not to be sacrificed for the supposed integrity of these units. In the context of the particular border dispute between Mysore and Maharashtra, the concept of a larger integrated unit is particularly irrelevant. The importance of the village as unit is all the greater in the case of States like Maharashtra and Mysore as the boundary between these States is the boundary between people speaking languages belonging to two different stocks, viz. the Indo-Aryan and the Dravidian. The Government and the people of Maharashtra have always insisted on the adoption of the village unit for the purpose. Though the definition of the Mysore position is not equally explicit or clear, the insistence of the Mysore Government on considering only "minor adjustments" within a limited border area leads to the same conclusion. Any adjustments within a limited area have perforce to be defined in terms of individual villages.

Wishes of the People

2.26. Some attention must be paid in this context to the test of the wishes of the people. This again is a factor which has been acknowledged to be important and relevant since the earliest times. It was referred to in drawing up the boundaries of Orissa. Mr. Justice Misra considered it in his report on Bellary and Pandit

Pant put it forward as justification for modification of the recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission. It has been specifically mentioned in the resolution setting up the present Commission. In the border areas in the Mysore State the wishes of the people have already been clearly ascertained on three occasions in the last ten years in the general elections of 1957, 1962 and 1967.

Other Factors

2.27. Finally, there are the factors which are often referred to as being capable of modifying the operation of the linguistic principle. These are the unity and security of India and financial, economic and administrative considerations (Appendix II-3). It is obvious that considerations of security and finance are not relevant in the particular case under reference. Linguistic reorganisation of even border States has not been held to affect security. The satisfactory resolution of a border dispute between two existing linguistic States should obviously strengthen the unity and security of India. Considerations of finance are important only in relation to the size of States and this is not affected by such adjustment of boundaries as is likely to result from the present reference. The interpretation of economic and administrative factors is less clear. The best way to interpret their significance is to refer to the actual manner in which they have been allowed to affect reorganisation of the States during the last decade.

2.28. The States Reorganisation Commission recommended transfer of certain territory from Bihar to Bengal. Among the main reasons mentioned for this transfer were (1) facilitating traffic between north and south of West Bengal and (2) enabling West Bengal to acquire control of the Indo-Pakistan border along its entire length. These were very strong administrative reasons as they pertained to making much easier the administration of a State which had been badly cut up by partition. The only other modification of linguistic boundaries which has been justified by administrative reasons has been that of the creation of the central enclave of Chandigarh as a result of the partition of Punjab. This, however, is a matter which is under reconsideration at present.

2.29. The two main instances of a modification of boundaries because of economic reasons relate both to the requirements of the construction of a big dam. An area was transferred from Rajasthan to Madhya Pradesh by the Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh Act, 1959 (47 of 1959), 'in the interest of proper and smooth execution' of the Gandhi Sagar Dam on the river Chambal. Similarly, 156 villages were transferred from the West Khandesh district of Maharashtra to Gujarat at the time of the Bombay Reorganisation Act, 1960 (11 of 1960), in order to facilitate construction etc. of the Ukai Project in the Surat district. This was done as these villages were to be depopulated due to their submergence because of the Ukai Project in the Surat district in the Gujarat State. In this connection the following extract from the report of Shri Justice Misra on Bellary taluka (paragraph 31) is significant:—

“From the point of view of the economic well-being of the people there is not much to be said. Ordinarily the transfer of a taluka to one State or the other should not affect its economy.”

“I cannot see any legitimate ground for thinking that these exports and imports will suffer by the integration of Bellary to Mysore. Whether the taluka goes to Andhra or Mysore the trade and commerce will continue to move in their normal channels.”

2.30. Barring such very important administrative and economic considerations, no other factors have been allowed to affect the proper delimitation of linguistic boundaries. Even in the case of reorganisation of the State of Punjab, the considerations of the irrigation and power projects put forth against the linguistic principles were overruled by the Punjab Boundary Commission. The position of towns, cities and market areas on the border has in no case been allowed to justify deviation from the strict linguistic boundary.

2.31. In the light of the fundamental basis of the reorganisation of the States in India derived in this chapter, the case of the Government of Maharashtra is explained in the subsequent chapters.

III

CASE OF THE GOVERNMENT OF MAHARASHTRA

The Commission on Maharashtra-Mysore-Kerala Boundary Disputes has been appointed by the Government of India to make recommendations with a view to solving the existing boundary disputes between the States of Maharashtra and Mysore (and Mysore and Kerala) taking into consideration the fundamental basis of the reorganisation of the States in India. The Commission is at liberty to devise its own procedure for ascertaining public opinion. Apart from these, no guidelines have been specified by the Government of India.

3.2. In the previous chapter, a comprehensive historical review of the reorganisation of the States in India has been taken in order to ascertain the fundamental basis thereof. It will be evident therefrom that the principal underlying idea in undertaking the reorganisation of the States from time to time was to bring together people speaking the same language and having cultural affinity so that the welfare of the people of each constituent unit as well as of the nation as a whole is promoted.

Principles

3.3. To bring together on a just and rational basis the largest number of people speaking the same language and having cultural affinity on the borders of the States of Maharashtra and Mysore, the Government of Maharashtra suggest the following principles:—

- (i) Village as the unit;
- (ii) Geographical contiguity;
- (iii) (a) Relative majority of Marathi or Kannad-speaking people;

(b) In the case of an uninhabited village, it should be included in the State in which the majority of the holders of land of the village reside ;

(iv) Wishes of the people.

It is now proposed to elucidate and elaborate these principles.

Village as Unit

3.4. Village in our country has all along been a unit of social and cultural life. Villages were almost autonomous prior to the British rule. In the present democratic administration, the village has once again regained its position and has become the basic unit of administration and developmental activities. With the democratic set-up decentralisation of power has been accepted as a policy and Village Panchayats have been reorganised and revitalised as the basic units for democratic administration and planning. With the advent of Panchayat Raj, the village is again coming into its own. It is also the basic unit of our Five-Year Plans. Village has thus assumed importance from every point of view—cultural, social, administrative, planning and developmental—and thus forms the most appropriate unit for demarcation of boundary between two States.

3.5. Another reason for adopting a village as the unit is that in such cases the villagers are the worst sufferers. They are less vocal and less organised and therefore removal of their suffering has to be the main object of readjusting the boundary between two linguistically different States. A satisfied villager is the most solid foundation for national unity and emotional integration especially as villagers constitute 80 per cent. of the population of this country. His convenience is better served by including his village in a State whose language he understands. Thus by taking a village as the unit not only are hardships removed but convenience is secured of the maximum number of people living on the border which is admittedly the main purpose of rationalisation of boundary.

3.6. The States Reorganisation Commission has given two reasons in paragraphs 156 and 157 on page 44 of its report in support of its argument why a village should not be adopted as the unit for determining the boundaries between the two adjoining States. The first is that,

as generally the population in border villages is largely mixed, provisions will have to be made to see that the language composition of a village does not change at any future time. The second is that the idea that all people who speak the same language and constitute a majority whether in a village or taluka should be attached to the State in which that language is dominant will do immense harm to our national growth. The Government of Maharashtra have carefully considered these views but are unable to agree with them. In the first place, the argument that if boundaries are demarcated on the village unit basis, special provisions will have to be made to see that the language composition of a village does not change, should apply with equal force to any other unit. Yet no special provisions have been recommended by the Commission to ensure that the language composition of districts, talukas, or firkas, as the case may be, on the boundaries of States does not change.

As regards the second argument, it is not correct to link up the demand for formation of linguistic States with the doctrine of 'home land' as was done by the States Reorganisation Commission. There are already a large number of people who, in the course of history, have come to reside in a State where the language of the State is different from their mother-tongue. Such minorities are to be found in all centres of trade, commerce, industry, education and administration. For example, in Indore City which is in the heart of a Hindi-speaking area and where the language of the majority is Hindi, there are more than 50,000 Marathi-speaking people. The doctrine of 'home land' would have come into play if the demand for linguistic provinces had contemplated bringing together all such scattered areas under the jurisdiction of the concerned linguistic State.

The argument that unhealthy trends underlying the 'home land' theory would be encouraged was against the formation of linguistic States. Once the demand for formation of linguistic States is conceded, it is not logical to refuse to demarcate the boundaries on the same principle with a village as the unit by creating a bogey of 'home land' theory. It is also to be noted that no case has occurred since the reorganisation of the States on linguistic basis which

supports the Commission's theory of 'home land'. As has been shown in the previous chapter, village has been several times adopted as a basis for fixing boundaries between States.

Geographical Contiguity

3.7. The principle of contiguity is accepted by the representatives of the Government of Mysore on the Four-Man Committee and it appears from the views of the Mysore Government that they also are in agreement with it. No further elucidation of this principle is consequently called for.

Linguistic Percentage

3.8. The next principle pertains to the linguistic percentage in a unit in the disputed area for deciding its inclusion in either of the States. While adopting a district as the unit for evolving a broad pattern of reorganised State, the States Reorganisation Commission generally followed the principle of relative majority. Deviation from this principle was made in respect of units smaller than a district, provided the linguistic majority of language group other than the majority language group of the district in such unit was at least 70 per cent., e.g. the Chandgad taluka in the Belgaum district. The States have been reorganised undoubtedly on the basis of linguistic homogeneity. It, therefore, follows that it would be desirable *prima facie*, to make such territorial adjustments as would minimise to the farthest possible extent the number of persons along the border, who will be inconvenienced by being left out on the other side of the border comprising the main body of its linguistic group. The existence of safeguards for linguistic minorities in the Constitution does not mean that the necessity to use them should not be reduced. Being in the nature of a remedy for linguistic maladies, the aim should be to avoid their use as far as possible and that can be achieved only if linguistic minorities are reduced to the minimum. It will be readily agreed that prevention is better than cure.

Wishes of People

3.9. The Government of Maharashtra urge that in a democracy like ours wishes of the people are of paramount importance in any scheme of readjustment of boundaries. Wishes of the people had no place in administration during the autocratic

rule of the British over this country and it was not till about 1918 that some form of popular Government was first envisaged. Since then the various Commissions, Committees and other authorities which considered the question of reorganisation of the provinces recognised 'wishes of the people' as an important factor in any such reorganisation as will be seen from the following:—

Government of India Act, 1919

The Government of India Act, 1919, gave authority to the Governor General in section 52-A to form new provinces after obtaining an expression of opinion from the local legislature affected.

Nehru Committee's Report

In 1928, the Nehru Committee appointed by the All Parties Conference, while discussing the question of the re-distribution of provinces, observed as follows:—

“We who talk of self-determination on a larger scale cannot in reason deny it to a smaller area, provided of course, this does not conflict with any other important principle..... Sentiment in such matters is often more important than fact.”

O'Donnell Committee's Views

In 1931, the O'Donnell Committee was appointed to examine and report on the consequences of setting up a separate administration for the 'Oriya-speaking peoples' and to make recommendations regarding its boundaries in the event of separation. In framing their proposals they considered several factors like language, race, etc., but more than all those factors they claimed to attach “great indeed primary, importance to the wishes of the inhabitants where they can be clearly ascertained.” (*vide* paragraph 6, Volume I, Report of the Orissa Committee (O'Donnell Committee).

Views of Karnatak Provincial Congress Committee and Karnatak Ekikaran Mahasamiti

In 1948, the Karnatak Provincial Congress Committee and the Karnatak Ekikaran Mahasamiti issued a detailed statement entitled “Linguistic Provinces and the Karnatak Problem”. The Chairman of the drafting committee of this statement was Shri R. R. Diwakar, Ex-Governor of Bihar, and its members included Shri D. P.

Karmarkar, former Minister of Public Health in the Central Cabinet. At page 65 of their statement the Nehru Committee's observation reproduced above has been quoted with approval.

J. V. P. Committee's Views

In 1949, the Linguistic Provinces Committee of the Congress, popularly known as the J. V. P. Committee, published its report. The following extracts from it will show that they attached great importance to the wishes of the people concerned:—

“Notwithstanding what we have said above, if public sentiment is insistent and overwhelming, the practicability of satisfying public demand with its implications and consequences must be examined.”

“We would prefer to postpone the formation of new provinces for a few years so that we might concentrate during this period on other matters of vital importance and not allow ourselves to be distracted by this question. However if public sentiment is insistent and overwhelming we, as democrats, have to submit to it but subject to certain limitations in regard to the good of India as a whole and certain conditions which we have specified above.”

States Reorganisation Commission's View

In 1955, the States Reorganisation Commission observed as follows in paragraph 228 (on page 64) of its report:—

“It cannot be denied that in a democratic country the wishes of the people of even small areas are entitled to the fullest consideration.”

3.10. The experience of the last ten years viz., the bifurcation of the Reorganised Bombay State and formation of the Punjab and Haryana States shows that ultimately wishes of the people prevailed. The proposal to reorganise the border State of Assam is also a pointer in this connection.

3.11. On the basis of these principles the areas in the Mysore State claimed by the Government of Maharashtra have been specified and discussed in Chapter VI. While doing so, administrative, economic, social and cultural considerations have been dealt with as a number of points have been made regarding them by the Mysore Government ever since 1956.

IV

MYSORE'S VIEWS

The Government of Mysore have set forth their case in their brochure entitled "Views of the Government of Mysore on Border Disputes between the States of Maharashtra and Mysore". They have not accepted the principles enunciated by the Government of Bombay (Maharashtra) except the principle of contiguity.

Reorganisation Final

4.2. The Mysore Government have taken the stand that the reorganisation of States of 1956 was final and is not open to question, except for settlement of minor differences by mutual agreement between the States concerned.

In support of their arguments, the Mysore Government have contended that the principles evolved by the Government of Maharashtra for solving the boundary dispute formed an important part in some of the amendments moved in the Lok Sabha during the debates on the States Reorganisation Bill and that they were rejected. According to them what was left for the settlement by the Zonal Councils under the provisions of section 21 (2) (b) of the States Reorganisation Act was minor adjustments confined to stray area or areas lying on the borders of the States. As evidence, they quote the following statement of the then Home Minister while piloting the States Reorganisation Bill:—

“It should be possible for the States concerned to settle these minor differences between themselves.”

Further, the word 'border' simply connotes a line of demarcation between one State and the other. The rejection of the amendment for establishment of a boundary Commission for determination of boundaries after taking into account the wishes of the people of the disputed area or areas was a clear proof of the Parliament's

intention not to give any scope or lend any support for the type of readjustment of areas which the Government of Maharashtra have been advocating. It was only minor differences which were to be referred to the Zonal Councils.

4.3. The above stand taken by the Government of Mysore has never been accepted by the Government of Maharashtra. This Government have stated that there has been no finality in this matter. They have all along contended that the specific point regarding the re-adjustment of boundaries was not taken in hand by the Parliament and the question of finalising the same did not at all arise. In fact, the problem of readjustment of boundaries between the two States was left over to be settled subsequently when the States Reorganisation Bill was enacted. For this very purpose a specific provision has been made under the States Reorganisation Act, 1956. Section 21 (2) (b) thereof authorises the Zonal Councils to discuss and make recommendations with regard to any matter concerning border disputes. The relevant portion of this sub-section is given below:..

“(2) In particular, and without prejudice to the generality of the provisions of sub-section (1), a Zonal Council may discuss and make recommendations with regard to,

* * * *

(b) any matter concerning border disputes.....”.

It was not that the Government of India were not aware of boundary disputes amongst various States ; they were, indeed, aware of the magnitude of the problem also. The question was regarding the machinery to be established for tackling such problems. The Government of India were of the view that the Parliament was not the proper forum to examine the various proposals regarding border adjustment and to deal with them in a satisfactory way. They, therefore, decided to refer these problems to the Zonal Councils. This is clearly borne out by what the Union Home Minister said in the Parliament. The relevant extracts are given below:—

(a) “The proposals for territorial adjustments exceed 170. Many of them are overlapping. It is obviously impossible

for the House to examine these proposals on their merits. No House can deal with these matters of detail in a hurried way." (*Vide* columns 2574 and 2575 of Lok Sabha Debates, Vol. VII, 1956).

- (b) "I know that with regard to some of the territorial matters, there is still a strong desire for readjustment. I made an effort in the Joint Committee to secure some sort of an agreement between the members representing the States concerned. Unfortunately, we did not succeed. Then, similar attempts were also made while the Bill was under discussion in the House but with no better results. Now, as Hon. members are aware, the Zonal Councils have been authorised to deal with all these boundary matters pertaining to readjustment of territories lying on the common borders of the States. I hope that when the States are formed, the Zonal Councils will meet and endeavour to resolve the disputes, because after all, the goodwill of neighbours is of much greater value than a small patch of territory; and it should be possible for the States concerned to settle these minor differences between themselves." (*Vide* columns 2574 and 2575 of Lok Sabha Debates, Volume VII, 1956).
- (c) "My appeal to the House is this. We have been engaged in a very huge undertaking for the last many months. The country has been subjected to tremendous strain. It requires a little easy time, so that this ferment may subside or evaporate and the tension may be relaxed. There were, in fact, very earnest proposals from prominent members of this House to the effect that this entire Bill should be kept in abeyance for an indefinite period. If we cannot do that, we can at least for the time being concentrate only on the enormous amount of work that will have to be done after the Bill has been passed and then give a secondary place to the outstanding problems. They must be solved. I do not mean that they should be shelved; they must be solved." (*Vide* columns 2576 and 2577 of Lok Sabha Debates, Vol. VII, 1956).

(d) "I hope the Zonal Councils will be able to show better results and if every thing fails and if the problem is really of a special significance and there are special circumstances Government will take stock of the situation and see how it can be helped." (*Vide* column 2579 of Lok Sabha Debates, Vol. VII, 1956).

4.4. The above quotations bring out the fact that the chapter of the re-adjustment of boundaries was not closed on passing of the States Reorganisation Bill; it was left over to be considered not only by the Zonal Councils but where they failed even by the Government of India.

Mysore Chief Minister's Statement

4.5. It is interesting to note the immediate reaction of the first Chief Minister of Mysore, Shri S. Nijalingappa, in his speech on the floor of the Mysore Legislature on the 24th December 1956, an extract from which is given below:—

"Now, Sir, though a new State has been formed it is true that as the address remarks, there are quite a large number of sections, large adjuncts of territory which contain people who speak Kannad and which are still to come to us. I take this opportunity to inform the House that to bring these areas into the new State, I am in correspondence with the various Chief Ministers concerned and also with the Centre.

I must also admit at the same time that there are areas, small areas no doubt, where the majority of the people speak a language different from Kannad. I for one will not hesitate to have the areas included in their respective linguistic States. It would be necessary. But while it may be difficult to transfer those territories immediately I want to assure those linguistic minorities, that nothing will be done to affect their interests adversely. They will be treated with due consideration and sympathy. We have a large section of the Marathi-speaking areas, fairly considerable areas. Though it is doubtful whether they want to go to the Bombay State or not, so long as they are with us we have to treat them with care and consideration."

4.6. The Chief Minister of Mysore was thus aware that there were fairly large Marathi-speaking areas remaining in Mysore, and was even willing to part with them but for his doubt whether they really wanted to go to the Bombay State or not. The Marathi-speaking people have since repeatedly removed this doubt by clearly indicating their desire to be included in Maharashtra. It is obvious that the stand subsequently taken by the Government of Mysore that the reorganisation of the States is final or that readjustments can only be minor is an afterthought.

4.7. Instances are not wanting where boundaries have been readjusted after the enactment of the States Reorganisation Bill. The boundaries between Madras and Andhra Pradesh which had remained unsettled since 1953 were adjusted in 1959. In the recent past, even major adjustments have been carried out; for example, the bilingual Bombay State was split up into Maharashtra and Gujarat even after the States Reorganisation had taken place; only a few months ago the Punjab State was split into two States: Punjab and Haryana. It would not, therefore, be correct to say that no changes whatever are to be made once the States are formed. It is true that certain amendments regarding principles to be adopted in such cases and specific proposals for readjustment of State boundaries were moved in and rejected by the Parliament. But they were not rejected on merits; that was done on the specific understanding that they would be considered by the Zonal Councils subsequently. In these circumstances it would be totally incorrect to say that considering such readjustment would amount to a second reorganisation of States.

4.8. The following facts emerge from of the above discussion:—

- (i) that the boundary dispute not only exists but persists;
- (ii) that quotations given above clearly indicate that the Chief Minister of Mysore had admitted in 1956 that the question of adjustment of boundaries involving large areas exists and it should be solved;
- (iii) that the Government of India or the Parliament never treated the question as a closed chapter;
- (iv) that large scale adjustments have been carried out after the passing of the States Reorganisation Act;

- (v) that even major changes have taken place in the States which were reorganised under the States Reorganisation Act.

The appointment of this Commission made by the Government of India under their Resolution No. F. 38/13/66-SR, dated the 25th October 1966, (Appendix II-1) is a clear indication of the existence and intensity of the problem; further, the contention of the Government of Mysore in paragraph 3 of the Rejoinder by the Mysore Chief Minister submitted to the Four-Man Committee that "this decision of Parliament establishes that the present boundaries are permanent and not flexible except for minor adjustments" does not survive. On the contrary the view all along held by the Government of Maharashtra stands vindicated.

Minor Differences

4.9. In support of their contention that the adjustment can only be a minor one, the Mysore Government rely on the words "minor differences" and "small patch of territory" used by the then Home Minister in the Parliament and the meaning of the word "border". The wording of the section 21 (2) (b) of the States Reorganisation Act and the extracts from the speeches of the Home Minister given earlier and the one given below do not warrant any limitation of area of the adjustment to be made on the borders of the States concerned:—

"I am not going to say anything about the minor questions. I say minor in the sense they are relatively confined to border issues and do not suggest the complete merger of one State in the other or complete reformation of any particular State" (Speech made in Lok Sabha on 23rd December 1955).

4.10. The Home Minister's whole speech in its full context makes clear what he really meant by minor differences. He was dealing with a "very huge undertaking" viz. the formation of new huge States in all parts of India and boundary adjustments involving limited territories naturally appeared to him to be minor questions in that context. The territories involved in this dispute are also minor if they are compared with the size of either Maharashtra or

Mysore State taken singly and more so if taken together (Appendix I, Map No. 3). In these circumstances, the interpretation of the Government of Mysore that “minor differences” means “minor adjustment”, is not at all correct, much less their interpretation that ‘minor adjustment’ means only adjustment within a belt of ten miles on either side of the border.

Limit of Area for Adjustment

4.11. The suggestion of the Government of Mysore is that the adjustments should be confined to a ten-mile belt in the districts of the former Bombay State on either side of the existing boundary line. This suggestion is admitted to be purely arbitrary even by the Representatives of that Government. Obviously this dispute cannot be solved on any such arbitrary basis.

4.12. The Government of Mysore further suggest that even within the ten-mile belt only the villages where more than 70 per cent of the population speak Marathi or Kannada should be included in Maharashtra or Mysore respectively. In support, they refer to paragraph 298 on page 83 of the report of the States Reorganisation Commission, an extract from which is given below:—

“As we have observed earlier, we do not regard the linguistic principle as the sole criterion for territorial readjustments, particularly in the areas where the majority commanded by a language group is only marginal. It may also be recalled that, on the basis of the evidence tendered before it, the Dar Commission had come to the conclusion that it would not be proper to describe any area as unilingual unless the majority of one language spoken in that area was at least 70 per cent. and that any area below that should be considered as bilingual or multilingual as the case may be. We are generally in agreement with this view but in our opinion, the mere fact that a certain language group has a substantial majority in a certain area should not be the sole deciding factor.”

4.13. The view attributed to the Dar Commission, quoted in the above extract and endorsed by the States Reorganisation Commission is to the effect that no area should be considered

'unilingual' unless the majority of one language spoken in that area is at least 70 per cent. It may be pointed out that if the 70 per cent basis were to be applied in the sense in which the Mysore Government apparently understands it and only unilingual areas in this sense were to be considered for transfer, then the Belgaum district, which has only 63·8 per cent of Kannada-speaking people and the North Kanara district which has only 55 per cent of Kannada-speaking people should never have been transferred from the former Bombay State. Further, even the States Reorganisation Commission has not stuck to this percentage in all cases e.g. Bellary, Adoni, Raidurg and Alur talukas. The Government of Maharashtra urge that the only practicable way to resolve such disputes would be the 'relative majority' between the two contending language groups in such areas.

Pataskar Formula

4.14. The Mysore Government have stated that the Pataskar Formula had been evolved by the Governments of Madras and Andhra by mutual consent for the specific purpose of border adjustment between the two States. Besides, the scope of the dispute was limited to a narrow strip on either side of the boundary drawn up as a result of the Andhra State Act and only three talukas were affected to a certain extent. It is most significant, according to the Mysore Government, that this Pataskar Formula was not applied to the settlement of boundaries between the new States of Maharashtra and Gujarat though some of the Maharashtrians were keen on its application.

4.15. The Report of the Representatives of the Mysore Government on the Four-Man Committee, which dwells on the merits of the Pataskar Formula, contains further arguments why the Pataskar Formula is not suitable in the present case. It is stated that the application of the special principles (Pataskar Formula) was set out as an exception justifiable on the ground of mutual agreement between the parties. But now these very principles are put forth for adoption by giving a go-bye to the consideration and principles applied to all States by the States Reorganisation Commission and approved by the Parliament.

4.16. The Government of Bombay never stated that their proposals were based on the ' Pataskar Formula '. In fact, the Government of Bombay made their proposals even before the Pataskar Formula became known. As, however, the principles suggested by the Government of Bombay are akin to the principles of Pataskar Formula, some of the points raised by the Mysore Government are dealt with below.

4.17. A formula does not become worthless merely because it has been envolved by mutual consent. The contention of the Mysore Government that the area involved in the present dispute (1076 villages) is very large in comparison with the Andhra-Madras dispute (469 villages) is also not correct.

4.18. The Mysore Government's observation that the Pataskar Formula was not applied to the settlement of boundaries between the States of Maharashtra and Gujarat, is incorrect. Presumably the observations refer to the allocation of 156 villages in the West Khandesh (Dhulia) district and 17 villages in the Umbergaon taluka to the State of Gujarat. The villages in Dhulia district were to be submerged in the Ukai Project in the Gujarat State and were going to be extinct. Those in Umbergaon taluka were allocated to Gujarat because the panchayats of the concerned villages had passed resolutions expressing a desire for such transfer i.e. according to the principle of wishes of the people. Thus, if the Mysore Government's reference is to the villages mentioned above, their allocation to Gujarat was in accordance with the principles now proposed for adoption by the Government of Maharashtra. Besides, there was an agreement between the two concerned States and therefore the question of applying the formula or principles did not arise.

4.19. The Mysore Government's contention that the Pataskar Formula was applied to Andhra-Madras case by way of an exception to the principles adopted by the States Reorganisation Commission also does not appear to be correct. The plain fact is that the States Reorganisation Commission had not considered the question of the Andhra-Madras boundary which was ultimately decided on the principles of contiguity, village as unit and linguistic majority.

A district was at best a suitable unit for drawing up a broad outline of the reorganised States but it is not a suitable unit to draw the exact boundary between two States on the basis of language. This is even supported by the following extract from the statement made by the then Prime Minister regarding the formation of Andhra State in the House of the People on the 25th March 1953.

“The case of Bellary District has to be considered specially and it cannot be treated as a single unit for attachment to any State. It is bilingual and considerable part of it has a clear majority of Kannada-speaking people.” (Column 2806 of Parliamentary Debates, 1953—Volume 2, Part II.)

A village is the most suitable unit to draw the exact boundary between two States on the basis of language especially to reduce the linguistic minorities to the barest minimum.

Census of 1951

4.20. In support of their contention that the mother-tongue figures of the Census of 1951 are not accurate, the Government of Mysore have stated that Mr. J. B. Bowman, Superintendent of Census Operations, Bombay State, has observed in his report that he found wilful distortion in the replies to question 8 (bilingualism) in the Belgaum Municipal area. They have, therefore, concluded that there is every justification to presume that the mother-tongue figures are also not accurate. The following extract from Chapter II of the Administration Report of the Census of India, 1951, Volume IV, Bombay, Saurashtra and Kutch (pages 10 and 11) shows that the presumption of the Government of Mysore is not warranted and that the mother-tongue figures of the Census of 1951 are reliable, according to Mr. Bowman himself:—

“There was some linguistic trouble, principally in Belgaum District. The expressed apprehension was that Marathi and Kannada-speaking enumerators would be biased in favour of their respective mother-tongues. The focus of the trouble was Belgaum itself where it was alleged the Municipality had not appointed an adequate number of Kannad enumerators. Both the Karnatak and Maharashtra Congress Committees passed

resolutions that enumeration should be done by persons having different mother-tongues working in pairs in areas where linguistic tension existed. These resolutions were passed almost on the eve of the Census as the trouble manifested itself late. I flew to Belgaum and met the protagonists of Kannada and Marathi, and the dual enumeration principle was implemented in Belgaum City. I revisited Belgaum as the enumeration period was nearing conclusion.

It was also alleged that Kannada was suffering in Nipani and Sholapur by reason of the partiality of enumerators. I visited Nipani while the Census was going on. I found no evidence of wrong recording of mother-tongue, nor was the atmosphere in linguistic circles there strained as it undoubtedly was in Belgaum City.

There was some minor linguistic trouble over Konkani in Karwar District, but this attained no dimensions. I did find wilful distortion in the replies to question 8 (bilingualism) in Belgaum Municipal area. Here even educated persons who were protagonists of Kannada or Marathi professed not to use any language other than their mother-tongue, presumably from fear that acknowledgment of the fact would strengthen the position of the other language. The bilingualism figures in such areas are probably not excessively accurate, but particulars about mother-tongue are, I believe, quite reliable everywhere."

In the face of these remarks of the Census Superintendent whose mother-tongue was English and who cannot consequently be said to be a partisan of either Marathi or Kannada, it is difficult to accept the Mysore Government's argument.

Maharashtra's Proposals not beneficial to Kannad-speaking people

4.21. It is suggested by the Government of Mysore that the adjustment proposed by the Government of Maharashtra will not result in a satisfactory solution to the problems of the Kannad-speaking people. It is argued that the result of the proposed adjustment would be that as against 2·06 lakhs of the Kannad-speaking people to be transferred to the Mysore State from the Kannad-majority areas in the Maharashtra, 1·36 lakhs of Kannad-

speaking people from the Marathi-majority areas in the Mysore State would be transferred to the State of Maharashtra, and that this would not achieve a satisfactory solution of the problem of the Kannad-speaking population. If this argument is to be pursued the effect of not transferring the Marathi-speaking people will also have to be considered.

In Mysore Border Area

	At present	After accepting Maharashtra Government's proposals	Number of people whose inconvenience will be removed after accepting Maharashtra Government's proposals
Marathi-speaking people ..	4,52,000	69,000	3,83,000

In Maharashtra Border Area

	At present	After accepting Maharashtra Government's proposals	Number of people whose inconvenience will be removed after accepting Maharashtra Government's proposals
Kannad-speaking people ..	2,07,000	1,34,000	73,000

From the above table it will be seen that the number of the Marathi-speaking people who will be transferred to Maharashtra according to the proposals of the Government of Maharashtra is larger than the number of Kannad-speaking people in Maharashtra who will be transferred to Mysore. This is inevitable because the number of Marathi-majority villages retained in Mysore is much larger viz. 816 as compared with the number of Kannad-majority villages retained in Maharashtra viz. 260. If there was parity in this respect there would not have been such disparity in the quantum of benefit accruing to the Marathi-speaking and Kannad-speaking people.

Exceptions to the Linguistic Principle

4.22. The Government of Mysore have proposed that (i) irrespective of linguistic considerations, the area required for head-works, reservoirs, etc., of the existing or proposed irrigation or power projects should be included in the State in which the area benefitting from such irrigation or power projects is situated, and (ii) irrespective of linguistic considerations, villages required for installations connected with water supply, power supply or sewage disposal of a city should form part of the State in which such city is included. These considerations have been dealt with in paragraphs 2.27 to 2.30 in Chapter II.

4.23. This Government has dealt with in this memorandum only such of the important points which have been disclosed so far in the case of the Government of Mysore and their representatives on the Four-Man Committee. If any new points are made hereafter, they will be dealt with later.

4.24. The points made by the Government of Mysore for treating Konkani as a language separate from Marathi and the grounds advanced by them for retention of the specific areas claimed by this Government are examined in Chapters V and VI respectively.



KONKANI-MARATHI

Relation of Marathi-Konkani

It is considered imperative to deal with the question of relation between Marathi and Konkani rather exhaustively in view of the observations made from time to time by the representatives of the Government of Mysore. To illustrate, paragraphs 109 and 110 of the report of the representatives of the Government of Mysore on the Four-Man Committee are quoted below :—

“ 109. The case of the Maharashtra Government is that the talukas of Karwar, Haliyal and Supa are a part of Konkani, which they choose to call a Marathi-Konkani area of the Canara District. They first put forward the theory that Konkani is not an independent language, but a dialect of Marathi, having no script. At the same time, they appear to be well aware that it is difficult to establish this proposition.”

“ 110. In fact this is a hotly controversial point. Scholars, Historians and Linguists are sharply divided and some hold views, which are almost diametrically opposite to those of some others. There are three schools of thought. Broadly speaking, if one puts forth the view that Konkani is a dialect of Marathi, there is another which asserts that Marathi is derived from Konkani and there is a third which maintains that Konkani is an independent language, having no kinship with Marathi.”

Konkan and Konkani language

5.2. Geographically, Maharashtra has been intercepted by the Sahyadri range and consists of two parts. The part consisting of the coastal plain between the sea and the Sahyadri has been known as Konkan and the other part above the Ghats is known as Desh. The word ‘Konkani’ is derived from the word ‘Konkan’ and the Konkani language extends along the coast

from the river Damanganga in the north to the river Gangavali in the south. It is a well-known fact that a spoken language changes after every few miles. It is, therefore, not surprising that the Konkani and spoken Marathi languages also differ to some extent from place to place in the abovementioned tracts without, however, altering the base. This is partly due to the diversity of form which Konkani displays, difference being manifest not only with each locality but also with each community and caste, but these diverse versions of Konkani have certain undeniable fundamental characteristics in common with Marathi.

Language and Dialect

5.3. The experts have opined that it is difficult to give an all embracing definition of 'language' and 'dialect'. However, for the purpose of understanding the connotations of both these words, the following extracts would throw sufficient light. If Sanskrit is taken to be the language, Marathi, Gujarati, Hindi, etc. can be termed as its dialects :—

“In other words we have to recognise in Sanskrit, in its widest sense, not one standard language, but also many standard dialects differentiating themselves from each other through their regional characteristics and each developing within its own region according to its chief characteristics in its temporal evolution.” (Dr. S. M. Katre, *Prakrit Languages and their Contributions to Indian Culture*, Bombay, 1945, page 4).

“Thus, in a sense, all Romance languages, all Celtic languages, all Germanic languages, all Slavic languages, and all Indo-Aryan Vernaculars are merely dialect groups of a common Aryan or Indo-European language.” (*Selected Writings of Edward Sapir in Language, Culture and Personality* edited by D. G. Mandelbaum, California, 1949, page 83).

In his book “*The Story of Language*, London 1952, page 46”, Mr. Mario Pei says—

“A third reply is that there is no intrinsic difference between a language and a dialect, the former being a dialect which, for some special reason, such as being the speech-form of the locality which is the seat of the Government, has acquired pre-eminence over the other dialects of the country.”

Definition of Dialects

5.4. Dr. Wyld has defined “dialect” to mean “type, form, variety of speech spoken by a particular community, either in a definite region or area (Regional Dialect), or among a given class (Class Dialect), distinguished to a greater or less degree from the other forms of speech by differences of pronunciation, grammatical forms, syntax, idioms, vocabulary. There is no essential distinction between a dialect and a language, but it is often convenient, and the usual practice is to apply the former term to subordinate varieties of speech, in use among comparatively small communities, and the latter, to the speech of whole peoples or nations, especially to that type (itself a dialect in the stricter sense) which is the vehicle of the main body of the people’s literature. No language constitutes an absolute unity in its spoken forms, but is differentiated into several sub-varieties or dialects.” (Henry, Cecil Wyld, *the Universal Dictionary of the English Language*, London, 1932, p. 303).

Marathi and its dialects

5.5. Desh and Konkan are merely the two parts of the well-defined territory known as Maharashtra. Various dialects communal and local, are spoken in both these parts. The dialects known as Chitpawani, Deshasthi and Kunbi are the examples of the communal dialects, while Gomantaki, Karwari, Malvani, Varhadi and Ghati are examples of the local ones.

It is, however, a matter of common knowledge that these different dialects are used merely for the purpose of speaking, while for the purpose of writing, only one language—that is Marathi—has been used over the whole region since the time of Dnyaneshwar. A critical examination of the copper plates, inscriptions and other old materials now available and collected from different parts of that territory will completely support this view. Hindu saints, again, hailing from the remotest corners of Maharashtra have all written their poems and Psalms in the same language, to give a few names, Dnyaneshwar, Ekanath, Tukaram, Soiroba, Subhanand of Ankola (North Kanara) Shiva Munishwar Kaikeni and Tukaram Baba of Goa—all those wrote in Marathi. Even foreign missionaries like Father Stephens, Croix, Gama Minguel, who toiled in Goa in the

17th century wrote their Christian Puranas in the same language, namely literary Marathi, for the benefit of converted Hindus who all spoke Konkani.

The fact is that both the literary Marathi and the various dialects noted above have a common parent, that is, they are immediately derived from the same transitional form of Apabhramsha of the Maharashtri-Prakrit. It is for this reason that Dr. (Sir) R. G. Bhandarkar who was an orientalist of international fame calls the Gomantaki dialect (Konkani) the Goanese Marathi (p. 13 of his Wilson Philological Lectures 1914). Another eminent linguist and philologist, late Dr. P. D. Gune, speaks of the same dialect as Konkani-Marathi in his well-known work (*An Introduction to Comparative Philology*, p. 212). Eminent western orientalists like Dr. Stein, Beames and others have held the same view.

How dialects developed and differed from Marathi

5.6. In the year 1941, a Committee consisting of the following trained philologists, scholars and men in public life with mother tongue as Konkani was appointed by the Marathi Literary Conference held at Sholapur to go into the question of the relation between the Marathi and Konkani:—

- (1) Dr. V. S. Sukhthankar, M.A., PH.D. (Bombay), Director Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, Editor of the Critical Edition of the Mahabharata.
- (2) Dr. J. A. Collaco, L.M. & S., M.L.A., J.P. (Goa), Mayor of Bombay.
- (3) P. V. Kane, Esq., M.A., LL.M. (Ratnagiri), Advocate, High Court, Bombay, Fellow and Vice-President, Bombay Branch Royal Asiatic Society, Author of History of Dharmashastra, etc., Editor, Kadambari, Sahityadarpana, and numerous other works.
- (4) Dr. V. M. Kaikini, B.A., F.R.C.S. (Karwar), Hon. Surgeon, K.E.M. Hospital, Bombay.
- (5) S. V. Palekar, Esq., B.A., LL.B. (Karwar), Advocate, High Court, Bombay.
- (6) A. K. Priolkar, Esq., B.A. (Goa), Editor, Damayanti Swayamwar, Paixaode Cristo, etc.

- (7) B. R. Kagal, Esq., B.E. (Karwar), Land and Development Officer, New Delhi, President, Brahan-Maharashtra Conference, 1941.

The Committee has, in paragraphs 2 of its memorandum, observed as under:—

“ The Standard Marathi language of today has evolved out of Maharashtri by devious stages of development, of which the earlier stages are but dimly perceptible (*see Bhandarkar : Wilson Philological Lectures*, p. 198). It is upon a form of a language arrived at an early stage of this development that the current Konkani is based. Large sections of people speaking this primeval form of Marathi settled down in Konkan. In an age when the political conditions were in a state of chronic unsettlement, when means of communication were meagre and travel was fraught with danger, it was only natural that the mountain ranges of the Sahyadri should stand as a barrier almost completely isolating Konkan from the rest of Maharashtra. In this state of isolation, its residents, on the one hand, failed to keep in touch with the linguistic developments up the Ghats ; and on the other hand they developed diverse idiosyncrasies of speech, owing to manifold influences due to contact with local populations and the interplay of political, social and cultural factors upon their daily life. Each caste and sub-caste was in medieval times a well-knit cultural entity, sharing a common heritage of traditions, philosophy of life, and sectarian prejudice ; naturally it tended to evolve its own peculiar form of speech. This was of course modified, to some extent, from place to place ; for the people came into contact with other classes of the locality, at different stages of cultural development and possessing a common local linguistic heritage, and were doubtless influenced through this contact. Thirdly, the Northern Konkan was more in touch with Desh than the districts of Kanara where a large Konkani speaking population had migrated, and this last-named population has been long in the sphere of influence of Kannada and other Dravidian languages. Political conditions, such as the conquest of Goa by the Portuguese, has been another factor which has been responsible for some peculiar local developments

in Konkani. And lastly, the conversion of a large number of people to Christianity and Islam, and the resultant acquisition by the converts of an altered outlook and cultural background, has added yet another important influence moulding the Konkani dialects. These circumstances explain how the various dialects developed, and came to differ from one another and from the standard Marathi language.”

There is abundant literary evidence to support the above conclusion. To illustrate this point, a few words and sentences which vividly bring out the common characteristics and the similarity between Marathi and different dialects of Konkani are given below:—

(A) *Words*

English	Modern Marathi	Current Konkani	Old Marathi	Quotations from old Marathi words (Circa-13th Century)
Night	रात्र	राति	राति	तेविचि सटवियेचे राति । न विसंबिजे वाती-ज्ञानेश्वरी, (राजवाडे), १८ : ८३४.
Day	दिवस	दीस	दीस	केतुले एक दीस राज्य केले-लीळा, १ : १
Evening	सायंकाळ	सांजवेळ	सांजवेळ	तेथ मृगांभ सांजवेले । होय जैसे-ज्ञाने. १८ : २०८
Down	खाली	खाला	खाला	तेथ उडी घातली खाला । रथौनिया-ज्ञाने. १ : २६७.
More	आणखी	आणिक	आणिक	आणिक कव्हणिचि नेणती-लीळा २ : १०.

(B) *Sentences*

मध्यवर्ती मराठी	चितपावनी (चिपळुणी)	कुडाळी (मालवणी)
(१) दुसऱ्याचें बरें घ्यावें.	(१) दुसरेचां चखोट घेवां.	(१) दुसऱ्याचां बरा घेवचां.
(२) तिचा नवरा आला	(२) तिचा घोऊश आयलो.	(२) तिचो घो आयलो.
(३) तुज्जें नांव काय ?	(३) तुज्जां नांव कितां ?	(३) तुज्जां नांव काय ?
(४) माझा बाप त्या लहान घरांत राहतो.	(४) माझो बापुस ते धाकटे घरांत रेहचे.	(४) माझो बापुस त्या लहान घरांत रवता.
(५) मुलीने मिरची आणली.	(५) चेटीन मिसांग हाडली.	(५) चेडवान मिसांग हाडली.

The equivalents of two Konkani dialects of the five Marathi sentences are given above. The Konkani (Karwari) equivalents

with the Kannada equivalents of the same Marathi sentences are now given below:—

कोंकणी (कारवारी)	कानडी
(१) दुसऱ्यालें वरें घेवचें	(१) बेरेयवरदु चलो तक्कोळ्ळुवदु.
(२) तिगलो घो आयलो	(२) अवळ गंडनु बंदनु.
(३) तुगेलें नांव कितें ?	(३) निन्न हेसरू एतुं ?
(४) मगेलो बापय त्या ल्हान घरांत रावता	(४) नन्न तंदे आ सण्ण मनेयल्ली इरूत्ताने
(५) चल्यान मिसांग हाडली	(५) हुडुगी मेणसु तंदळु.

It will be seen from the above illustrations that there is a great affinity and similarity between Marathi and the various dialects of Konkani and outstanding dissimilarity between Kannada and various Konkani dialects as also Marathi. This is obvious as Konkani and Marathi belong to one group of languages, Indo-Aryan, while Kannada language belongs to an altogether distinct language family, Dravidian.

Influence of Marathi and Kannada on Konkani

5.7. Relying on Dr. S. M. Katre, the Government of Mysore in paragraph 49 of their “ Views on the Border Disputes between the States of Maharashtra and Mysore ” have stated that Konkani that is spoken in the northern-most region is moulded more or less by Marathi language, while that spoken in the two Kannada districts and south-west has been moulded by Kannada, Malayalam etc. The position in this regard has already been explained on page 14 of the statement submitted to the Four-Man Committee by the Chief Minister of Maharashtra. It is stated therein as under:

“ Konkani as spoken in the different tracts has, like all other languages, a local admixture of vocables derived from the local language, and in areas adjacent to the Kannada-speaking region its vocabulary includes Kannada words as it includes words of other adjacent languages in other tracts.The affinity of languages is, however, determined on the basis of the morphology of the languages and identities in their structure and not on the basis of common vocables.”

Historical background of current Konkani

5.8. In order to prove the common characteristics and similarity between the current Konkani and spoken Marathi, it is proposed to

give a historical background in brief from the "Memorandum on Konkani" issued by the Committee of Philologists and scholars referred to in paragraph 5·6.

"A comparison of the current Konkani speech with the language of early Marathi literature now extant shows a surprising affinity between the two. We limit ourselves to the works of Jnaneshwar and to the Mahanubhav literature, particularly because all their literature was composed far away from Konkan. Jnaneshwar flourished in the 13th century, and his commentary on the Geeta, one of the greatest works in the whole range of Marathi literature, was written at Nevasa, in the eastern part of the Ahmednagar district. The Mahanubhav sect was founded in the 13th century and flourished mainly in the Berars, though it attracted adherents from a wider field. The Mahanubhavas have left behind a rich literature. It was originally transcribed in cipher, and is therefore now available in a considerable degree of textual purity. In appendix A, we have collected evidence of a few significant points of similarity between the language of this, the earliest specimen of Marathi literature now extant, and the Konkani dialects of today. This evidence must be read in the light of the following considerations. On the one hand the Konkani dialects today, after centuries of development under manifold influences, cannot be expected to be identical with the spoken language of Konkan in the 13th century. And on the other hand, the language of the early Marathi writings is the literary language of Desh. The intelligentsia was nurtured on Sanskrit literature and was so far accustomed to express itself in the Sanskrit language. The earliest authors who wrote in Marathi wrought a literary revolution in Maharashtra, and it is only natural, in view of their literary traditions, that their literary style should be elevated, by the influence of Sanskrit above their ordinary speech. Therefore the fact that there are such striking points of similarity between current konkani and the earliest form of literary Marathi of Desh must lead inevitably to the conclusion that Konkani must have parted company from Deshi not much earlier than the 13th century."

This is not peculiar to Konkani and Marathi. In this country as well as in foreign countries in similar circumstances, changes

of identical nature have in fact taken place. Some authorities on the subject are quoted below:—

“ It is a notable fact that when people migrate from a focal area they may keep their speech more intact than do those who stay at home. The American speech of West Virginia remains in some respects closer to seventeenth century English than does any living dialect in England, itself. French Canadian retains features of Voltaire’s language that would now sound archaic in the conversation of Paris. The Portuguese of Brazil has preserved certain turn of phrase from the days of discovery and adventure which have been shed long ago by the inhabitants of Lisbon.” (Simeon Potter, *Modern Linguistics*, London, 1957, p. 135).

“ With regard to innovations that lead to dialectalization, two interesting observations have been made. The first is that dialects of isolated regions often tend to preserve old forms to a greater degree than the literary language.... For this there is a valid reason ; national, literary languages are far more exposed to the world’s linguistic cross-currents than are remote dialects, and their tendency to innovate is correspondingly greater.

The second observation is that when people migrate from their homeland, they are more likely to keep intact the language of the period of migration than do those who stay behind.” (Mario Pei, *The Story of Language*, op. cit., p. 50).

Here the observation of Dr. P. D. Gune, made in his book (*An Introduction to Comparative Philology—3rd Impression*, Poona, 1958, page 19) is also very much relevant. The observation runs as follows:—

“ How want of communication isolates a dialect is best exemplified in our Berari and Konkani dialects. The speakers of these separated somehow from the main body of Marathas and were so surrounded by peoples speaking foreign languages and were also for a time so isolated, that they have yet preserved a form of Marathi that is as old as the 13th century, if not earlier. The influences that tended towards change in Maharashtra proper were absent in these cases.”

In his book (Evolution of Awadhi, Allahabad 1937, p. 9-10) Dr. Baburam Saksena has made the following observations:—

“Awadhi today is merely the common language of the people, and is not a literary vehicle. The Hindustani dialect (whether Hindi or Urdu) is the literary language of the Awadhi area. The uneducated people speak Awadhi amongst themselves and so do the educated people if they are talking amongst Awadhi people. I have found that in the district towns, educated people coming from outside the Awadhi area generally adapt themselves to Awadhi forms and very soon become good Awadhi speakers. In the larger towns, however, such as Lucknow, Allahabad, Fyzabad, where there is a large admixture of educated people from the non-Awadhi area the vehicle of thought amongst educated people is Hindustani.”

Marathi, the literary language of Konkani

5.9. Marathi has always been the literary language of Konkani, even though its speech may have to a certain extent differed from it. On this point the evidence from Goa, both indigenous and of foreign origin is of particular interest. The copperplates and other epigraphical records of the pre-Portuguese period are couched in the language which is identical with the literary language of those days, *vide* Appendix B on page 18 of the Memorandum on Konkani issued by the Committee consisting of Dr. V. S. Sukthankar, and six others, already referred to above. This appendix lists a few extracts from the Marathi copperplates during the period from 1348 A.D. to 1436 A.D. Father Stephens in his celebrated *Christa Purana* (1614) states in sonorous verse why he was impelled to write the life of Christ and his teachings in Marathi. Those who had been converted to Christianity felt the lack of works which would bring to them, in their own language, the message of Christ. They requested the reverend Father to provide them with works written in Marathi on Christ and His teachings which they could understand. It was in response to this request that the ‘*Christa Purana*’ was written in Marathi language in the popular form of ‘*Ovi*’ which is peculiar to the Maharashtrian culture and linguistic traditions. (*Vide* Appendix C of the Memorandum on Konkani mentioned above).

He was followed by other Missionaries who composed religious works in the Marathi language. Apart from the 'Christa Purana' there are among the more noteworthy works, the 'Peter Purana' of the French Jesuit, Fr. Etienne de la Croix etc. It is significant that the language employed by all these missionary writers is the Marathi of those days, interspersed occasionally with words of local origin.

Having regard to their object, it is obvious that they must have chosen as their vehicle of expression the language of the locality and the one which even common people could understand. However, history shows that due to persecution of the highest degree it was not only difficult for the Goans to keep with them Hindu religious books but they were also nervous of keeping or even acknowledging the possession of 'Christa Purana' and other literature in Marathi but in Roman script due to apprehension of social ostracism. Dr. Cunha Rivara observed in 1858 as under :—

“And now at the moment when we are writing this (1857) we find great difficulty in discovering any of these books, for many individuals hide them and even deny their possession, with the fear that they may be objects of mockery and derision and be branded as rude; if perchance they acknowledge that they possess and read these monuments of their language.”

Goa was under the rule of Portuguese for a long time dividing the Konkani-speaking area. Southern part of the Konkani-speaking area was thus cut off from the Desh. To the South of Goa are North and South Kanara districts to which a large number of Konkani-speaking population seems to have migrated as a result of persecution policy of the Portuguese rulers. Nevertheless, the spoken language of those who fled particularly to North Kanara is essentially similar to the spoken language of Goa and Marathi was adopted as vehicle of literary expression as was done in Goa. It is relevant to mention here that in southern parts of Ratnagiri *i.e.*, the talukas of Malwan, Vengurla and Sawantwadi, the language spoken is almost the same as the Konkani, spoken in Karwar and some parts of Supa and Haliyal. No one has, however, contended as yet that the language of Malwan, Vengurla and Sawantwadi talukas is anything but Marathi.

Konkani, a dialect of Marathi

5.10. The great philologists, scholars and gentlemen in public life whose mother tongue has been Konkani have arrived at the following conclusion:—

“ Konkani dialects have developed out of an older form of the current standard Marathi, and that in grammar, syntax and vocabulary, they bear very close resemblance to the standard Marathi. It is true that they differ from standard Marathi in some respects, but these differences are no more marked, and no more important than they are between any two Konkani dialects. These differences moreover are due to accidents of history and are such as commonly exist in the spoken versions of any language. Konkani, therefore, appears to us to be a dialect of Marathi.” (Page 8, Memorandum on Konkani by Dr. V. S. Sukhthankar and six others, 1941).

5.11. The above conclusion is in accord with the conclusion of the other scholars of established repute. In his Linguistic Survey of India, Vol. VII, page 164, Sir George Grierson affirms that Konkani is the dialect of Marathi and definitely controverts the suggestion that it is an independent language. He also specifically mentions that the missionaries of Goa and Mangalore contend that Konkani is not a dialect of Marathi and controverts it pointing out that the contention is based on the misconception that dialect connotes a deterioration of some other form of speech (*Vide* Appendix F in the Memorandum on Konkani).

Extract from the book “ Science of Language ” (4th Edition), London 1864, pages 51-52 by Max Muller would be relevant for reference here. It runs as under :—

“ It is a mistake to imagine that dialects are everywhere corruptions of the literary language. Even in England, the local patois have many forms which are more primitive than the language of Shakespeare, and the richness of their vocabulary surpasses, on many points, that of the classical writers of any period. Dialects have always been the feeders rather than the channels of literary language.”

Sir Ramkrishna Bhandarkar, whose mother-tongue was Konkani refers to ‘ Goan Konkani ’ as ‘ Goanese Marathi ’ (Wilson Philological Lectures—1914—page 13).

5.12. Dr. Suniti Kumar Chatterjee, noted linguist of international repute holds the view :

“It is well known that Kannada is an important Dravidian language and it differs basically from Indo-Aryan speech like Marathi, Konkani and the rest....With regard to the relationship between Marathi and Konkani, opinions differ....Konkani and Marathi, therefore, are to be regarded closer and allied speeches and for all practical purposes the Konkani which is split up in numerous dialects, can be regarded as being within the orbit of Marathi.”

5.13. Encyclopædia Britannica also supports the view that Konkani is a dialect of Marathi :

“Besides the standard form of speech, there is only one real dialect in Marathi, viz. Konkani (Konkani) spoken in country near Goa. There are also several local varieties and we may conveniently distinguish between the Marathi of the Deccan, that of the Central Provinces (including Berar), and that of the Northern and Central Konkani. In the Southern part of the District of Ratnagiri this latter Konkani Marathi gradually merges into the true Konkani dialect through a number of intermediate forms of speech. There are also several broken jargons, based upon Marathi, employed by aboriginal tribes surviving in the hill country. (*Vide* Encyclopædia Britannica—Vol. 14—“Marathi”—pages 856-857, Edn. 1959).

The following extract from Collier's Encyclopædia also supports this view :—

“*Marathi* also written Marathi or Mahrathi, the modern form of Maharashtra is the southern most NEO-INDIC language of continental India, spoken by about 27,000,000 persons in the province of Bombay, Central Provinces and *Portuguese India*....”
[Collier's Encyclopaedia (Volume 13) page 135.]

It may also be added that several competent observers since the earliest times have unhesitatingly affirmed that the language of Konkani is Marathi. (Sir E. Perry, page 254, *Bird's Eye View of India*, Phillippe Neri Pires, *A Grammatica Maratha* 1854, page 103. *Vide* Appendix D in the Memorandum on Konkani).

5.14. That the language of the Konkani-speaking people is Marathi was also the official view of the Central Government and the Provincial Governments. In the *Bombay District Gazetteer* of North Kanara District of 1883, page 114, the Konkani-speaking population is included in the Marathi-speaking population of the district and is not separately mentioned. Similar classification was adopted in the Census Reports till 1921, when the demands for linguistic States started, controversies and claims began to be put forward that Konkani was different from Marathi and that it should be separately enumerated in the Census of 1921. This move seems to have been actuated more by political considerations than those of language. From 1921 Census, in keeping with the British policy of encouraging fissiparous tendencies, a departure was made Konkani being treated as a separate language for the purpose of Census enumeration. The former Government of Bombay as far back as 1948 took the following decision :—

“Konkani is not an independent language. It is only a dialect of Marathi. Mainly it is a spoken language. Obviously, therefore, the main language of the Konkani-speaking people is Marathi. (*Vide* Government Letter, E. and I. Department, No. S. 28/19535-F, dated the 9th July 1948 ; Appendix III—1).

To meet the demands of the Konkani-speaking people in Karwar, Supa and Haliyal talukas besides Kannada which was the official language of the district, Marathi was also recognised as the Regional language in April 1950. (*Vide* Government Resolution, P. & S. D., No. 2026/46, dated the 1st April 1950 ; Appendix III—2).

5.15. In his book on “The Cochin Tribes and Castes”, Vol. II, Madras 1912, pages 348-349, Shri L. K. Anantha Krishna Iyer who cannot be accused of being partisan of Marathi-Konkani, states :

“For nearly a quarter of a century after the conquest of Goa by the Portuguese they (Saraswat Brahmins) continued unmolested under the Portuguese Governors. During that period they took to a lucrative trade in European goods; but with the

establishment of the Inquisition at Goa, and the religious persecution set on foot by the Portuguese, the community left Goa in voluntary exile. While some submitted to conversion, others fled to north and south ; and those that fled to the south, settled themselves in Canara and Calicut. Receiving a cold reception at the hands of the Zamorin, they proceeded further south and sought the protection of the rulers of Cochin and Travancore, where they flourish even to this day....The Brahmins immigrants are called Konkani, because of their having emigrated from Konkani ; and they speak the Konkani dialect of Marathi."

The Mysore Gazetteer, Vol. I (Chapter VII—page 252) edited by Shri C. Hayavadana Rao, Edition of 1927, states that Konkani is a dialect of Marathi.

5.16. The Fact Finding Committee (State Reorganisation), 1954 consisting of important personalities from the Princely State of Mysore reproduced on page 3 of its report Grierson's opinion contained in his Linguistic Survey of India that—

"Kanarese is bounded on the north and west by Marathi and its dialect Konkani, on the east by Telugu and Tamil and on the south by Tamil, Kodagu and Tulu."

and stated as under:—

"The position today after nearly half a century is almost the same."

The Committee also admitted that Konkani is allied to Marathi:

"Admittedly Tulu is a dialect of Kannada and is only a spoken language the script used being Kannada. Konkani is allied to Marathi. We could, therefore, be justified in reckoning Tulu speakers in the Kannada population of the district." (*Vide* page 14 of the Report of the Fact Finding Committee) (State Reorganisation).

The report is as recent as 1954 and the stand subsequently taken by the present Government of Mysore, i.e., after 1956 is obviously an after-thought.

5.17. On a supplementary question, put by Shri N. O. Sarji, M.L.A., to the starred question No. 100 in the Mysore Legislative Assembly, the Speaker Shri B. V. Baliga observed as follows:—

“This question does not arise. I can understand Marathi. My mother tongue is Konkani. Eighty per cent is common.” (page 2196 of the Mysore Legislative Assembly Debates, dated the 2nd April 1964—Vol. IV—No. 31).

Views of local people

5.18. The Konkani-speaking people have already proclaimed that Konkani language belongs to Marathi family and that they have allegiance only to Marathi as their literary and traditional language through resolutions passed by almost all the Village Panchayats and the three Taluka Development Boards of Karwar, Supa and Haliyal Talukas.

Konkani is akin to Marathi

5.19. In expressing its opinion that the Konkani language originated as an independent language from old Prakrit the Government of Mysore has relied on the linguist Dr. S. M. Katre, In his book—“The formation of Konkani”, p. 152, Dr. Katre has observed as follows:—

“Taking into account all the main features of Konkani, we may now definitely assign it to the South-Western group (having Marathi and Gujarati as its nearest of kin) with a tinge of the Central group (Hindi, especially in the dative postposition—ka). The differentiations noted in the formation of the direct singular of masculine nouns in their extended form and the divergent postpositions for the dative clearly mark off Konkani as a separate language from Marathi, preserving in many respects an earlier stage of development. Its position as a separate language (and not a mere dialect) is thereby proved, but phonological considerations show that both belong to a common parent Prakrit.”

The Government of Mysore have, however, while quoting Dr. Katre, conveniently avoided a reference to his following observations on page 158 of the same book:—

“On the other hand a unificatory movement is afoot to mingle Konkani with Marathi and to adopt Marathi as the common

medium. And conditions are quite favourable, for Marathi is nearest to Konkani, being derived from the same common ancestor, and a large percentage of the Konkani-speakers are already conversant with the literary Marathi through the literature of the saints."

5.20. In an opinion poll recently ordered by the Government of India in Goa, the choice given was either to merge with Maharashtra or continue as Union territory. No choice was given to merge in Mysore. This conclusively proves by implication that Konkani is a dialect of or at least akin to Marathi.

5.21. As regards the views of Shri Silva referred to by the Government of Mysore, it may be noted that Shri Silva is not a linguist. His views need therefore no consideration in view of the views expressed by eminent philologists and linguists and other persons already referred to earlier.

Limits of Konkani

5.22. In paragraph 100 of their Report the representatives of the Government of Mysore on the Four-Man Committee stated that the word "Konkan" is applied to denote that strip of land which lies along the Western Coast i.e. between Arabian Sea on the one side and Sahyadri Mountains on the other. About the northern and southern limits of Konkani, however, there is no unanimity. According to Keshava Kudwa, quoted by the representatives, it is stated, the area beyond Karwar northwards upto Bombay was called as Konkani and Gomantak or Goa as Dakshin Konkani.

5.23. Shri Buchanan, the historian and traveller writes in his famous book 'Kanara, Mysore and Malbar' that according to the ancient geographers, Konkani littoral extended from Daman-ganga river in the North of Thana district to Gangavali river to the South of Ankola Taluka in the North Kanara district. On page 149 of Bombay Gazetteer (Kanara District), Vol. XV, Part II, 1883, it is stated:

"The country to the north of the Gangavali river, which according to Buchanan was the division between Haiga or Haiva and Konkani, though larger than the southern district, yielded much less revenue."

Grant Duff, the historian of the Marathas, writes :

“ In 1720, the northern part of Kanara low lands seems to have been ceded to the Marathas by the Court of Delhi, as a part of the Maratha ownrule or ‘Swarajya’ in the Konkan’

He further says :

“ Of the 13 places mentioned in the Konkan the last three are Phonda (in Goa), Kudal (in Sawantwadi) and Ankola”.

Even Dr. Grierson who is quoted in paragraph 101 of their report by the representatives of the Government of Mysore to show that the original seat of Konkani language was Goa, has observed in the Linguistic Survey of India, Vol. VII, page 163 :

“ The Konkani language is spoken throughout the Konkan from Malwan in the North to Karwar in the South. In the North Kanara, Konkani is the home tongue of higher caste Hindus and partly also of the lower classes. It is the language of the Native Christians of North and South Kanara.....”.

If Dr. Grierson could be accepted by the representatives of the Government of Mysore as an authority for the original seat of Konkani language, his authority for the area in which Konkani is spoken must logically be accepted.

5.24. British historians C. A. Kincaid and Denis Kincaid have also observed that the southern limit of Konkan is Karwar:

“ It (Maharashtra) lies on the Western Shores of Middle-India and in shape of a triangle. Its base is the sea from Daman to Karwar. The perpendicular side is formed by a line running from Daman beyond Nagpur. The hypotenuse is formed by an irregular line from beyond *Nagpur to Karwar.*”

“ Maharashtra has three district divisions. Of these the Sea board below the Sahyadri mountatins is known as the Konkan, the tract occupied by Sahyadri is known as the Mawal, while the wide, rolling plains to the east are known as the Desh.” (C. A. Kincaid, I.C.S. and Rao Bahadur D. B. Parasnis “A History of the Maratha People” Vol I, Page 1, Chapter I).

“ The Marathas are the people to inhabit the triangular province of India known as Maharashtra, the base of the

triangle lying on the sea coast from *Daman* to Karwar and the apex running inland to Nagpur." (page 15) (Denis Kincaid, I.C.S. "The grand Rebel, An impression of Shivaji, Founder of the Maratha Empire").

5.25. Everyone including the Government of Mysore (*vide* paragraph 51 of their Views on Border Disputes between the States of Maharashtra and Mysore) is unanimous on the point that Konkani language belongs to the Indo-Aryan group to which Marathi belongs, whereas Kannada belongs to an entirely different system of languages known as "Dravidian" languages. On the basis of the views held by eminent philologists and scholars as well as by the Central Government and the Provincial Governments and considering that the morphology and structure of the Konkani language are akin to those of Marathi as also the fact that it is demonstrably true that any one who knows Marathi can easily follow Konkani of Karwar, Supa and Haliyal Talukas and that any person whose mother-tongue is Konkani in these Talukas has no difficulty in following Marathi, the Government of Maharashtra are of the firm view that Konkani is a dialect of Marathi and none would deny the fact that it is certainly akin to Marathi.

5.26. *To summarise.*—(1) Everyone including the Government of Mysore is unanimous on the point that Konkani language belongs to an Indo-Aryan group of languages to which Marathi belongs ; whereas Kannada belongs to an entirely different system of languages known as Dravidian languages.

(2) The morphology and the structure of the Konkani language are *akin* to those of Marathi.

(3) A number of eminent philologists and linguists of international fame as well as scholars and historians have held that Konkani is a dialect of Marathi.

(4) Eminent persons whose mother-tongue has been Konkani have unequivocally accepted that Konkani is a dialect of Marathi.

(5) It is demonstrably true that any one who knows Marathi can easily follow Konkani of Karwar, Supa and Haliyal talukas and that any person whose mother-tongue is Konkani in these talukas has no difficulty in following Marathi.

(6) Dr. Katre, Shri Suniti Kumar Chatterji and Mr. Silva who are of the opinion that Konkani is an independent language, have agreed that Konkani is most akin to Marathi.

(7) The Government of the pre-reorganised Bombay State and the Government of Mysore had held that Konkani is a dialect of Marathi.

(8) The Government of India have also by necessary implication held the same view while ordering the opinion poll in Goa.

(9) Various Konkani dialects have no standard form because all the Konkani-speakers have all along given their allegiance to Marathi only as their language of traditional literature and literary expression.

(10) The people of Karwar, Supa and Haliyal talukas have by passing resolutions unequivocally expressed the opinion that Konkani language belongs to Marathi family.



INDIVIDUAL AREAS—APPLICATION OF PRINCIPLES

In the foregoing chapters the general principles enunciated by the Government of Maharashtra for resolving the boundary dispute and those which the Government of Mysore have so far urged in support of their stand have been discussed. It is now proposed to specify the areas lying on the border of the Mysore State which, according to the principles propounded in paragraph 3.3 earlier by this Government, should be transferred to the Maharashtra State to justify such transfer. The arguments advanced by the Government of Mysore against the transfer of such individual areas are also proposed to be examined.

Areas claimed

6.2. On the basis of the principles of contiguity, relative linguistic majority and wishes of the people, the Government of Maharashtra claim 16 towns and about 800 villages in the border districts of Belgaum, Karwar, Bidar and Gulbarga in the Mysore State (*vide* Appendix IV). The taluka-wise break-up of these towns and villages is as follows:—

BELGAUM DISTRICT

(i) *Belgaum taluka*.—7 towns and 79 villages—

(a) Each of the 7 towns has relative majority of Marathi-speaking people over Kannad-speaking people and is contiguous to the Marathi majority area.

(b) Of the 79 villages, 68 have relative majority of Marathi-speaking people and have contiguity.

(c) Four villages, although they have Kannad relative majority, they are hemmed in on all sides by Marathi majority villages claimed.

(d) Five villages are uninhabited villages. Of these, 4 form enclaves in the Marathi majority area and one is on the border of the Marathi majority area with the Kannad majority area.

The transfer of the latter should be decided on the basis of the principle mentioned in paragraph 3.3 of Chapter III.

(e) Two villages, although they have Kannad relative majority, are interposed between two large areas in which the Marathi-speaking people are in majority. Besides, the people of these villages have expressed their desire for being transferred to Maharashtra through the resolutions of their Gram-panchayats, which could be produced.

(ii) *Khanapur taluka*.—2 towns and 204 villages—

(a) Each of the 2 towns has relative majority of Marathi-speaking people over Kannad-speaking people and is contiguous to the Marathi majority area.

(b) Of the 204 villages, 176 have relative majority of Marathi-speaking people and have contiguity.

(c) Two villages, although they have Kannad relative majority, they are hemmed in on all sides by Marathi majority villages claimed.

(d) 26 villages are uninhabited villages. Of these 22 form enclaves in the Marathi majority area and four are on the border of Marathi majority area with the Kannad majority area. The transfer of the latter should be decided on the basis of the principle mentioned in paragraph 3.3 of Chapter III.

(iii) *Athni taluka*.—10 villages—

All the villages have relative majority of Marathi-speaking people and have contiguity.

(iv) *Chikodi taluka*.—3 towns and 38 villages—

(a) Each of the 3 towns has relative majority of Marathi-speaking people over Kannad-speaking people and is contiguous to the Marathi majority area.

(b) Of the 38 villages, 35 have relative majority of Marathi-speaking people and have contiguity.

(c) Three villages, although they have Kannad relative majority, they are hemmed in on all sides by Marathi majority villages claimed.

(v) *Hukeri taluka*.—18 villages—

All the villages have relative majority of Marathi-speaking people and have contiguity.

KARWAR DISTRICT

(i) *Karwar taluka*.—3 towns, 47 villages—

(a) Each of the three towns has relative majority of Marathi-speaking people over Kannad-speaking people and is contiguous to the Marathi majority area.

(b) All the villages have relative majority of Marathi-speaking people and have contiguity.

(ii) *Supa taluka*.—131 villages—

(a) Of the 131 villages, 115 have relative majority of Marathi-speaking people and have contiguity.

(b) Three villages, although they have Kannad relative majority, they are hemmed in on all sides by Marathi majority villages.

(c) 13 villages are uninhabited. Of these, 12 form enclaves in the Marathi majority area and one is on the borders of the Marathi majority area with the Kannad majority area. The transfer of the latter should be on the basis of the principle mentioned in paragraph 3.3 of Chapter III.

(iii) *Halyal taluka*.—1 town and 119 villages—

(a) The town has relative majority of Marathi-speaking people and has contiguity.

(b) Out of 119 villages, 77 have relative majority of Marathi-speaking people and have contiguity.

(c) Three villages, although they have Kannad relative majority, they are hemmed in on all sides by Marathi-Majority villages.

(d) 39 villages are uninhabited. Of these 33 form enclaves in the Marathi majority area and 6 are on the borders of the Marathi majority area with the Kannad majority area. The transfer of the latter should be on the basis of the principle mentioned in paragraph 3.3 of Chapter III.

BIDAR DISTRICT

(i) *Humnabad taluka*.—28 villages—

(a) Out of the 28 villages, 27 have relative Majority of Marathi-speaking people and have contiguity.

(b) Only one village, although it has Kannad relative majority, it is hemmed in on all sides by Marathi majority villages.

(ii) *Bhalki taluka*.—49 villages—

(a) Out of the 49 villages, 44 have relative majority of Marathi-speaking people and have contiguity.

(b) Only 5 villages, although they have Kannad relative majority, they are hemmed in on all sides by Marathi-majority villages.

(iii) *Santpur taluka*.—69 villages—

(a) Out of 69 villages, 54 have relative majority of Marathi-speaking people and have contiguity.

(b) Two villages are uninhabited villages and both form enclaves in the Marathi majority area.

(c) 13 villages, although they have Kannada relative majority, they are hemmed in on all sides by Marathi-majority villages.

GULBARGA DISTRICT

(i) *Aland taluka*.—8 villages—

All the villages have relative majority of Marathi-speaking people and have contiguity.

The following Table will show the number of towns and villages in each of the talukas in the four districts mentioned above. The Table serves to show that apart from the results worked out on the basis of village as unit and other considerations mentioned in paragraph 3.3 earlier, the linguistic percnetage in the aggregate villages claimed in each of the talukas is between 59 to 84:—

District	Taluka	Number of towns and villages	Total population	Linguistic percentage		
				Marathi	Kannada	Others
(1) Belgaum	Belgaum	84+2	2,20,389	61	23	16
	Khanapur	206	68,522	77	12	11
	Athni	10	20,858	61	33	6
	Chikodi	41	1,07,856	73	17	10
	Hukeri	18	15,094	80	15	5
(2) Karwar	Karwar	50	67,107	78*	15	7
	Supa	131	17,451	84*	6	10
	Haliyal	120	13,122	67*	17	16
(3) Bidar	Humnabad	28	22,303	63	16	21
	Bhalki	49	47,879	59	30	11
	Santpur	69	46,669	60	26	14
(4) Gulbarga	Aland	8	4,978	68	24	8
Total ..		814	6,70,228	*Includes Konkani.		

A list of all the villages and towns claimed in the above talukas is enclosed (Appendix IV).

Why 1951 Census figures ?

6.2-A. For the purposes of claiming these areas, population figures of the Census of 1951 have been adopted. The reasons for doing so are mentioned below:

When the reorganisation of States on linguistic basis took place in 1956, the census figures of 1951 were taken into account and as this dispute is an off-shoot of that reorganisation it would be appropriate to take the same figures into account on this occasion. By specific provision in the State Reorganisation Act, this dispute was left to be decided by the Zonal Council, but the Zonal Council failed to do so and delay of over ten years in settling it has resulted. The mere fact that such a delay has taken place would not justify reliance on the data of a latter date. For, if the settlement of the dispute is for any reason further postponed, let us say to 1972, even the figures of 1961 will have to be discarded in favour of the figures of 1971. The normal rule in the settlement of disputes, whether in Courts or otherwise, is to take into account only the facts and circumstances as they exist at the time a dispute arises and not subsequent changes which take place whether as a result of the acts of the parties to the dispute or otherwise. The basis of this rule is that once a dispute starts, neither party is to be allowed to take advantage of or suffer from subsequent developments.

This question is of vital importance in this dispute because roughly 240 families constitute one per cent of the population in Belgaum city and the Marathi-speaking people who are in a majority according to the 1951 Census can be reduced to a minority by the transfer of a few Marathi-speaking families away from this city as well as by the transfer of a few Kannad-speaking families to this city. It is also possible to reduce them to a minority by starting new activities and employing Kannad-speaking people to carry on those activities. In fact, it cannot be disputed that Kannad-speaking people have moved into these areas in considerable numbers on account of exigencies of service and such other reasons since the reorganisation of States in 1956.

Again, in this connection the wording of the Resolution of the Government of India appointing this Commission will have to be taken into account. The Resolution says *inter alia*, “with a view to solving the *existing* border disputes between the States of Maharashtra and Mysore and Mysore and Kerala....” It could have equally well said, “with a view to solving the border disputes between the States of Maharashtra and Mysore and Mysore and Kerala....” The word “existing” in the Resolution must, therefore, be given some meaning. “Existing” means existing from a prior date and as the dispute began in 1956 the figures of 1951 Census would alone become relevant. Existing dispute means the dispute of 1956 and it cannot mean dispute of 1966.

This interpretation finds full support in the wording of the Resolution of the Government of India stating its decision to reorganise the State of Punjab on linguistic basis so as to constitute from its territories two States, namely Punjab and Haryana States, and appointing a Commission to examine the boundaries of the Hindi and Punjabi regions of the State of Punjab and to recommend what adjustments, if any, were necessary in that boundary to secure the linguistic homogeneity of the proposed Punjab and Haryana States. [Appendix II (3)]. In that Resolution, a specific direction has been given to the Commission to have regard to the Census figures of 1961, but no such direction has been given in the Resolution appointing this Commission. The absence of such direction necessarily implies that this Commission has to take into account the Census figures of 1951 and not those of 1961. It is to be noted that the Resolution constituting this Commission was passed only a few months after the Resolution constituting the Commission for the division of the State of Punjab into two linguistic States of Punjab and Haryana and the omission to give direction regarding the Census figures to be used cannot but be deliberate.

It is again to be noted that the Census figures of 1961 had to be taken into account in splitting up the State of Punjab into two States because the decision to do so was taken for the first time in 1966. In the present case, the decision from which this dispute has arisen was in fact and in law taken in 1956, and whether it is

dealt with by the Zonal Council or by the Commission, the relevant figures would be the Census figures of 1951.

6.3. A map of all the talukas containing the areas in dispute is at Appendix I, Maps Nos. 1 and 2. The line drawn in green indicates the boundary generally as it would be according to the solution suggested by the Government of Maharashtra.

AREAS IN THE BELGAUM DISTRICT

Composition of Belgaum district

6.4. Prior to the reorganisation of the States, the Belgaum district formed part of the then Bombay State. It then comprised of the ten talukas viz. Athni, Belgaum, Chandgad, Chikodi, Gokak, Hukeri, Khanapur, Parasgad, Ramdurg and Sampgaon and one peta viz. Raibag. On the reorganisation of States, as recommended by the States Reorganisation Commission, the Belgaum district except the Chandgad taluka was included in the Mysore State. The Chandgad taluka was retained in the Bombay State as more than 70 per cent of its population was Marathi-speaking.

Area claimed from Belgaum district

6.5. The Government of Maharashtra have been claiming that the areas consisting of 86 towns and villages in Belgaum, 206 in Khanapur, 10 in Athni, 41 in Chikodi and 18 in Hukeri talukas in the Belgaum district of the Mysore State should be transferred to the Maharashtra State (see Table in paragraph 6.2).

Geographical features

6.6. This Marathi tract of the Belgaum district is a strip of about 50 miles running north to south and southwest along the top of the Western Ghats. This tract is mostly hilly with a high rainfall whereas the rest of the Kannada-speaking tract is more or less flat and has lesser rainfall. To the North of this tract lie the Sangli and Kolhapur districts in the Maharashtra State; to the West lie the Ratnagiri and Kolhapur districts in the Maharashtra State and to the South, Goa and the Marathi tracts of Supa and Haliyal from the Karwar district at present in the Mysore State. To the East lies the Kannada-speaking part of the Belgaum district. In short, the entire Marathi-speaking tract in the Belgaum district has

language affinity and geographical contiguity (North, South and West) with the Marathi-speaking areas and it is only to the East that it touches the boundaries of the Kannada-speaking areas. This Marathi-speaking tract is the natural link between South Konkan and the Ghats.

6.7. The Government of Mysore do not accept the geographical individuality and character of this tract in the Belgaum district and contend that it is imaginary as well as unrealistic. They have, however, not given any reasons in support of their contention that the geographical unity and individuality of this tract is imaginary and unrealistic. The Government of Mysore have also stated that this argument concerning geographical individuality and character of the tract would have been admissible had the Chandgad taluka which has already been included in the Kolhapur district been retained as part of the Belgaum district. Mere separation of the Chandgad taluka from this Marathi-speaking tract on administrative and linguistic grounds cannot affect the well established geographical individuality and character of this tract. The stand taken by the Government of Mysore is thus untenable.

The representatives of the Mysore Government on the Four-Man Committee have contended that this hilly tract is a part of Malnad area which is mostly Kannada-speaking. This is not borne out by the following extract from the book 'India and Pakistan' by Mr. L. H. K. Spate :—

“A strip about 6-14 miles wide in the extreme west carries tall evergreen forest, but most of the Malnad (roughly Shimoga, Kadur, and Hassan districts) has a mixed deciduous cover with teak, sissoo, and the most important sandalwood forests of India.” (p. 658).

Historical Background

6.8. The areas covered by the districts of Bijapur, Belgaum and Dharwar were taken over by the British in 1818 after the flight of Bajirao Peshwa and included in the Collectorate of Bellary in the Madras Presidency. In 1830, they were formed into a separate Dharwar Collectorate and added to the Bombay Presidency. After acquiring the areas of the talukas of Chikodi, Sampgaon and

Parasgad from the Kolhapur State, in about 1838, Belgaum was formed into a separate district with the Belgaum city as its headquarters. Since 1948, owing to the merger of States in the Southern Maratha Country, whose territories were greatly mixed up in this area, a population of some 5 lakhs was added to the population of the Belgaum district together with an accession of a thousand square miles to its area, purely and professedly on grounds of administrative convenience. Subsequently reorganisation of the States took place and the Chandgad taluka was separated from the Belgaum district and joined to the Kolhapur district. When Revenue Divisions came to be formed in the Province of Bombay, a separate Revenue Division in charge of a Commissioner was formed comprising districts of Bijapur, Dharwar, Belgaum, Kanara, Ratnagiri and Kolaba to which Kolhapur district was joined later on. This Division was called the Southern Division and its headquarters was the city of Belgaum. The Division was purely a territorial division formed for the convenience of the then foreign administration in which people had no voice or share. Considerations of language or the convenience or wishes of the people had no place in its formation. All this is a matter of record.

6.9. The Government of Mysore contend that historically the Belgaum district has always been part of the Kannada Kingdom, originally ruled by Chalukya Princes and subsequently by the Rashtrakutas and Rattas. After the fall of the Vijayanagar Empire, the region was overrun by Hyder Ali about the year 1776 and was subsequently taken by the Peshwas with the assistance of the British. In 1818, the country passed to the British and this area became a part, first of the Bellary district and later on of the Dharwar district when the Dharwar district was separated from Bellary. In 1838, the unwieldy jurisdiction was divided into two parts, the southern portion continuing to be known as the Dharwar district, while the northern portion was constituted as a separate district. The Government of Mysore further contend that the Belgaum tract has been administratively an integral part of Karnatak for centuries and that it is not necessary to refer to many historical facts which go to show that the boundaries of Karnatak extended upto the river Godavari in the North.

It is interesting to note that the Yadavas of Deogiri in the 13th century, Chhatrapati Shivaji in the 17th century and the Peshwa in the 18th and 19th century ruled over this area for a considerable period as is evident from the Maratha States in this region like Kurundwad Senior and Junior, Sangli, Miraj, Jamkhindi, Ramdurg, etc. Historical facts apart, the argument that the tract was governed by Kannada or Marathi rulers offers no solution to the problem of border dispute.

6.10. The Government of Mysore have observed :

“The areas which have been transferred from the Bombay State to the Mysore State under the States Reorganisation Act have been within the jurisdiction of the Karnatak Division for over 100 years. They were included within the jurisdiction of the Karnatak Provincial Congress Committee in 1921. That decision was accepted and has been adhered by all the neighbouring Pradesh Congress Committees including that of Maharashtra. There was an agitation again in 1929 at the time of the Marathi Literary Conference held in Belgaum and it will be found that the stalwarts of Maharashtra including Shri N. C. Kelkar unequivocally recognised that Belgaum was part of Karnatak.”

The Mysore Government have termed the Southern Division of the former Bombay State as Karnatak Division. There has never been a Karnatak Division as such. The Division *inter alia* included districts like Kolaba and Ratnagiri and later Kolhapur, which are undisputedly Marathi-speaking districts. The fact is that the Divisions of the former Bombay Province were merely administrative units. Actually, in 1948 when several Southern Marathi States merged, the territories of these States were absorbed, purely and professedly on grounds of administrative convenience in the nearest administrative units. This was made quite clear in public announcements on behalf of the Government of Bombay. It may be recalled that the then Bombay State was a linguistically composite State. The Southern Division was a bilingual Division. It will thus be seen that the formation of Revenue Divisions was not done on linguistic basis. If the districts of Kolaba, Ratnagiri and Kolhapur and the Chandgad taluka of the Belgaum district

of the so called Karnatak Division could be included in the Bombay (Maharashtra) State, there is no reason why the remaining Marathi-speaking tract of the Belgaum district should not be joined to the Maharashtra State. It has to be remembered that Maharashtra's claim is for the Marathi-speaking tract alone and not for the Belgaum district as a whole.

6.11. As regards inclusion of the Belgaum district within the jurisdiction of the Karnatak Provincial Congress Committee, the decision was taken in 1921, when the reorganisation of the States in India on the linguistic basis was nowhere on the horizon. Moreover, as Marathi area in the Belgaum district was surrounded by the Deccan States of Miraj, Sangli, Kurundwad, Kolhapur and Sawantwadi, separating it from the rest of Maharashtra, it could not be included within the jurisdiction of the Maharashtra Provincial Congress Committee. Besides, the territorial jurisdiction of the units of a political party would be irrelevant to the solution of this question. Even the Maharashtra State has got two Pradesh Congress Committees.

As regards the Mysore Government's contention echoed by their representatives on the Four-Man Committee that this decision has been accepted by all and as such the area is undisputedly the part of Karnatak, the following extract from paragraph 368 of the "Report of the representatives of the Mysore Government on the Four-Man Committee" speaks for itself :—

"We recall all this previous history mainly for the purpose of showing that the areas now in dispute were also in dispute between Maharashtra and Karnatak in earlier days."

Fact Finding Committee's Report

A Committee known as the 'Fact Finding Committee' consisting of eminent persons such as a retired Minister, a retired High Court Judge, and others was appointed by the Government of the then State of Mysore in connection with the reorganisation of State in June 1954 i.e. after the appointment of the States Reorganisation Commission by the Government of India. The Committee, which investigated relevant facts relating to the Kannada areas outside the then Mysore State have laid specific claims over many such

areas as Kannada areas. The Committee, however, observed as follows in respect of the Belgaum and the Chandgad talukas:—

“In these two talukas, however, the Marathi-speaking population accounts for 63·4 per cent. The linguistic affiliation of this area is bound to be open to controversy.”

It will thus be seen that even a committee avowedly appointed *inter alia* to list Kannada-speaking areas refrained from laying a claim to these areas as undisputed part of Karnataka.

6.12. Likewise, the observation imputed to Shri N. C. Kelkar, at the time of the Marathi Literary Conference held in Belgaum has no relevance for the point at issue, apart from the fact that it does not mean, read in its full context and background, what the Mysore Government now suggest, it does. It may be noted that the statement refers to the Belgaum district and not specifically to the Belgaum taluka or city. In fact, even after the readjustment proposed, greater part of the Belgaum district would still remain in the Mysore State. It is fantastic to suggest that Maharashtra's claim to the Marathi-majority areas of the Belgaum district was given away by the Marathi writer thirty years ago when the creation of States on linguistic considerations was totally undreamt of, by a general statement which, for its limited purpose, does not distinguish between the Belgaum city and the surrounding Marathi-majority area and the rest of the admittedly Kannada district of Belgaum.

Cultural affinity

6.13. The Marathi-speaking people of this tract are a part of the Marathi-speaking people of Maharashtra and they have the same cultural institutions as the people of Maharashtra. Their marriage ceremonies and religious rites are the same as those of the people of Maharashtra. The invitations for marriage of Urdu-speaking persons are generally printed in Urdu and Marathi. Instances are not wanting where even the Kannada-speaking people have issued invitations in Marathi. Even the advertisements of Kannada plays, etc. appear in Marathi.

In this area one comes across the same stratified structure of caste organisation, namely Brahmins, Marathas, Mahars and other small Marathi communities like Dhangars, Malis, etc. exactly

in the same way as in other parts of Maharashtra. On the other hand, among the Kannadigas, Lingayats and Vaishnava Brahmins are some of the more important communities.

6.14. The Government of Mysore have contended,—

“ There is no such peculiar organisation of caste structure in the so-called Marathi-speaking tract of the Belgaum district so as to mark it out from the rest of Karnatak. In fact, the same caste structure prevails all over Karnatak except for the domination of one or other community or communities in the different parts.”

Even if the broad pattern of the caste structure is the same in Maharashtra and Karnatak as in the Hindu Society everywhere, it cannot be denied that it reflects certain distinctive features in each region. Moreover, social and cultural affinities of the Marathi-speaking people in this tract are undoubtedly with the Marathi-speaking people in the Maharashtra State and not with the Kannada-speaking people in the Mysore State.

6.15. The blood relationship of the Marathi-speaking people in this tract is with the residents of Maharashtra and rarely with the adjoining Kannada-speaking population. The Government of Mysore have observed:—

“ It is difficult to verify such a broad statement and even in the subsequent discussions that have taken place between the former Government of Bombay and the Government of Mysore, no details have been mentioned about this point.”

The following extract from page 8 of the Census of India, 1951, Vol. IV, Bombay, Saurashtra and Kutch, Part I, is self-explanatory:—

“ Women migrate for marriage and men for jobs. Hence in migration between adjacent districts females predominated. 11,626 males and 22,484 females born in Kolhapur district were enumerated in Belgaum and 14,093 males and 27,329 females in Belgaum district were enumerated in Kolhapur.... ”

* * * * *

“ Where females predominate in a migration stream it is evidence amounting to certainty, that the migration is marriage migration.”

This conclusively proves the cultural affinity of the Marathi-speaking people in the disputed area with those of Maharashtra.

6.16. According to the Government of Maharashtra the village Patils and Vatandars of the Marathi-speaking tract are all Marathi-speaking and mostly drawn from Marathi communities. The Government of Mysore have contended that this statement is not correct and according to them one of the two Patils in the Belgaum taluka and all the Patils in Shahapur and Khasbhag are Kannada-speaking. This is however not correct.

6.17. The above considerations are only supplementary factors to the principles enunciated in paragraph 3.3 earlier viz. geographical contiguity, village as the unit, relative linguistic majority and wishes of the people on the basis of which the Government of Maharashtra claim this tract. The foregoing discussions will show that geographical, historical, social and cultural considerations not only do not go against the claim of Maharashtra but also uphold it by showing that this tract is bound with Maharashtra and as such its rightful place would be in the Maharashtra State.

S.R.C.'s Recommendations

6.18. The Government of Mysore rely on the observations and recommendations made by the States Reorganisation Commission in its report. Those are dealt with herein below one by one :—

(a) “ As regards the remaining ten talukas of Belgaum district, it has been claimed that two of them, Khanapur and Belgaum (including Belgaum town), as well as portions of Chikodi taluka, have closer affiliations with the Marathi-speaking districts of Bombay than with the adjoining areas in the proposed Karnatak State. The Marathi majorities in Khanapur and Belgaum taluks are slight, being 53.9 and 51.4 per cent, respectively. Six out of the remaining seven taluks are predominantly Kannada-speaking, and in the seventh, namely, Chikodi, the Kannadigas constitute the largest single language group.” (Paragraph 348 of the S. R. C. Report).

The linguistic composition of the Khanapur, Belgaum and Chikodi talukas which have been specifically referred to is as follows:—

Taluka	Marathi	Kannada	Others	Un-specified
Khanapur	.. 54·3 (53·9)	34·5	10·9	0·3
Belgaum	.. 49·8 (51·4)	35·5	14·6	0·1
Chikodi	.. 42·1	49·3	·8·4	0·2

(Figures in bracket indicate the figures given by the States Reorganisation Commission).

Even a cursory glance at the linguistic composition will show that the majority of the Marathi-speaking people over the Kannada-speaking people in the Belgaum and Khanapur talukas is substantial as against the slight majority of the Kannada-speaking people over the Marathi-speaking people in the Chikodi taluka. It is interesting to note that the Commission which referred to the absolute Marathi majority in the Khanapur and Belgaum talukas as slight, referred to the relative Kannada majority in Chikodi as largest single language group in the same breath. It is not clear why different standards and different expressions have been used by the Commission in its examination of the linguistic composition of these adjoining talukas thereby creating impressions not warranted by the linguistic composition.

(b) “All the talukas of Belgaum district have economic relations with both the Marathi as well as the Kannada-speaking areas. The Belgaum town is the centre of the transit trade in this area, which is chiefly in cotton and oil seeds. Neither the Belgaum town nor the other disputed areas, however, have any particularly marked economic affiliations with the Marathi-speaking districts of Bombay. There is no case, therefore, for detaching either Khanapur or Belgaum or portions of Chikodi from the rest of the Belgaum district.” (Paragraph 348 of the S. R. C. Report).

The Commission's observation about economic relations with Marathi and Kannada-speaking areas is vague. For arriving at any conclusions, it was necessary to make a comparative study of the economic relations with both the areas. The economic

considerations in support of its decision for not detaching either Khanapur or Belgaum or portions of Chikodi from the rest of the Belgaum district have been advanced without proper and adequate study. This is obvious from the Commission's incorrect statement that the Belgaum city is a centre of the transit trade chiefly in cotton and oil seeds. Even the Mysore Government have agreed that Belgaum is not a centre for trade in cotton and oil seeds. It is thus clear that the conclusions of the Commission are not borne out by facts.

(c) "It has been argued that the Belgaum town has an absolute Marathi majority and that due consideration should be given to this factor. Separate mother-tongue figures for this town were not compiled during the last Census. In the past, it has, however, for a variety of reasons, attracted a steady stream of immigrants from many areas. Even if it is admitted that this town has now a Marathi majority, in view of the very slight Marathi majority, in the taluka of Belgaum and the fact that economic relations are not particularly marked with any linguistic area, the future both of the taluk as well as of the town should, more properly, be decided on administrative grounds. If as many as nine out of the eleven taluks go to Karnatak (Chandgad going to Bombay and Belgaum being disputed), then, on administrative grounds, the Belgaum town, which is the district headquarters, alongwith the Belgaum taluka, should also go to Karnatak." (Paragraph 349 of the S. R. C. Report).

In this extract, the Commission has made three points, viz. (1) the mother-tongue figures for the Belgaum city are not available, (2) population of Belgaum is inflated by immigrants and (3) the future of the Belgaum taluka should be decided on administrative grounds.

The first point made by the Commission is incorrect as separate mother-tongue figures have been compiled for the Belgaum city in the 1951 Census. When the Commission could obtain the mother-tongue figures for the Chandgad taluka there is no reason why it could not have obtained similar figures for the Belgaum city.

The statement regarding the steady stream of immigrants to the city is vague and misleading. This is clear from the fact that even according to the figures given by the Government of Mysore, the Marathi-speaking people constitute 49·8 per cent in the locally born population as against the 51·6 per cent in the total population. The alleged immigration has not made any material difference in the percentage of the Marathi-speaking population. Apart from this, the point regarding immigration is irrelevant and should not have been brought in as only the linguistic composition then existing was relevant for deciding the issue. The Commission's arguments for discarding the claim for the Belgaum city on the basis of absolute Marathi majority are thus vague and incorrect. The fallacy in the Commission's arguments about slight majority and economic affiliations has already been considered earlier.

It appears that the economic and linguistic considerations advanced by the Commission were far from convincing and as such they had to take recourse to administrative grounds. The administrative ground advanced is that as nine out of eleven talukas (Chandgad going to Bombay and Belgaum being disputed) will go to Karnatak, the Belgaum city which is the district headquarters should along with the Belgaum taluka go to Karnatak. As a matter of fact, not only the Belgaum but Khanapur taluka was also disputed. The Commission has conveniently not made any reference to the Khanapur taluka which was undoubtedly disputed. Merely because nine other talukas go to the Mysore State, Belgaum should also go to that State cannot be considered as a very convincing argument. If the argument had been correct, the Commission should not have recommended the detachment of the Chandgad taluka. With the creation of the new States of Andhra, Madhya Pradesh, Gujarat, Punjab and Haryana, new State headquarters had to be and could be found for them. It, therefore, need not be stressed that finding out another district headquarters in place of the Belgaum city was and continues to be a comparatively easy task and it cannot be held as a valid reason for including the Belgaum city in Karnatak. Again the Commission themselves felt that loss of a district headquarters was not a severe handicap while recommending transfer of Bellary to

the Andhra Pradesh in spite of Shri Justice Misra's recommendations to the contrary.

While detaching the Chandgad taluka from the Belgaum district, the Commission has observed as follows :—

“ The Chandgad taluk of Belgaum district is predominantly Marathi-speaking and it has been established as a result of the resorting of Census slips that the Marathi majority in the taluk is as high as 92·4 per cent. It can conveniently be administered by the State of Bombay and Karnatak should have no objection to this proposal.”

In observing that the Chandgad taluka can be conveniently administered by the State of Bombay the Commission has obviously applied one standard to the Chandgad taluka and another to the other talukas of the Belgaum district. If Chandgad can be conveniently administered by Bombay (Maharashtra) State, other areas such as the Belgaum and the Khanapur talukas which have better rail and road communications with Maharashtra, can certainly be administered with greater convenience by the Maharashtra State.

(d) “ The retention of Kolar district in the Karnatak State and the addition of the major part of Belgaum district to it will, in our opinion be more advantageous to the new State than the continuance in it of the eastern portion of the Bellary district.” (Paragraph 332 of the S. R. C. Report).

“ The arguments which have been advanced in favour of maintaining the *status quo* with regard to Bellary are almost similar to those advanced for separating the Kolar district from and not including parts of the Belgaum district in the future Karnatak State.” (Paragraph 333 of the S. R. C. Report).

“ We have recommended earlier that the Bellary town along with the Bellary taluk should go to Andhra although the town according to Shri Justice Misra's report did not have a predominantly Andhra complexion ; our recommendation in respect of the Belgaum town follows the same principles.” (Paragraph 349 of the S. R. C. Report).

The Commission has argued that it has judged cases of Bellary and Belgaum on the same basis. A careful analysis of the reasoning adopted in dealing with each of these areas as given below, however, proves to the contrary :—

(i) Bellary and Belgaum are both district headquarters. In respect of Bellary the Commission observed as follows :—

“ When Shri Justice Misra originally reported, Mysore had to be given a new district town of sufficient importance from which Bellary, which was transferred to it, could be administered. This latter argument is not valid to the same extent today, because it is no longer a restricted redistribution which is being considered, but a large scale redistribution ; and Karnataka, which will be able to control areas which are to the north and west of those talukas of Bellary district which would still remain with it, will be able to make satisfactory arrangements for carrying on the district administration, even if Bellary town is taken away.” (Paragraph 341 of S. R.C. Report).

However, it observed as follows in respects of Belgaum :—

“ on administrative grounds the Belgaum town, which is the district headquarters, alongwith the Belgaum taluk should also go to Karnatak.” (Paragraph 349 of S. R. C. Report).

This is a glaring instance of making contradictory recommendations and justifying them as being made on the same principle.

(ii) Importance of the Tungabhadra Project to the Rayalseema district of Andhra had weighed with the Commission in recommending transfer of Bellary to Andhra. There is no such project in the Marathi-speaking tract of the Belgaum district.

(iii) The Bellary taluka had a Kannada majority of 52·52 per cent. and Shri Justice Misra who was appointed to enquire and report on this question had recommended that it should not be included in the Andhra State. This recommendation was accepted by the Parliament when they passed the Andhra State Act of 1953. The States Reorganisation Commission recom-

mended the reversal of this decision and transfer of the Bellary taluka and town to the Andhra State. This transfer was recommended by following its recommendation to retain the district of Kolar and the Belgaum taluka in the Mysore State in spite of the fact that they had Telugu and Marathi majority of 54·4 per cent and 51·4 per cent respectively. By giving the Telugu area of Kolar to Kannadigas the Commission created a pocket of Telugu minority in Karnatak. By proposing to give Bellary to Andhra, it suggested the creation of a similar pocket of Kannada minority in Andhra and by their proposal to include the Belgaum City and the surrounding Marathi area in the Mysore State it created a pocket of Marathi minority in Karnatak.

The above examination of the Commission's reasoning underlying the proposals regarding Belgaum does not stand any test of consistency and logic.

6.19. It is important to note that this approach of the States Reorganisation Commission was first assailed by the Kannadigas themselves. Immediately after the publication of the Commission's report, they started agitation against the proposal made by the Commission to include Bellary in Andhra and they persuaded the Government of India not to accept that proposal and to retain Bellary in Karnatak. In their representation to the Government of India, the Kannadigas then deprecated the argument of the Commission that as Kolar though Telugu was included in Karnatak, Bellary, though Kannada, should be included in Andhra. They called this argument 'barter-like' inasmuch as Kannada-Bellary was being bartered away to Andhra in lieu of Telugu-Kolar. They then declared that "If the Telugu-speaking people of Kolar want to go to Andhra none can stop them. If the Kannadigas (i.e. people of Bellary) want to remain in Karnatak none can force them out" (*vide* page 14 of S. R. C. Recommendations and Injustice to Bellary by the Bellary District Karnatak Action Committee, Bellary, 1955). Having thus sought to deprive the Kannad people to what legitimately was theirs, the States Reorganisation Commission wanted to compensate them by giving them, in addition to Kolar, the City of Belgaum and the surrounding area which should have gone to the Maharashtra State.

6.20. The Kannadigas could term the Commission's argument as barter like as it involved transfer of Bellary from Mysore in exchange of Kolar. If this barter itself was bad, unilateral transfer of Marathi-speaking areas of Belgaum to the Mysore State was worse. To add insult to injury, the Marathi tracts of the Belgaum district were transferred to the Mysore State though Bellary as well as Kolar were retained in the Mysore State under the States Reorganisation Act. Discriminatory treatment has thus been meted out to the Marathi tract of Belgaum and the Mysore State has been allowed to eat the cake and have it too.

BELGAUM TALUKA INCLUDING BELGAUM CITY

Wishes of the People

6.21. The Belgaum taluka consists of 146 villages and seven towns. The Belgaum City comprises four of these seven towns. The total area of this taluka is 394.4 sq. miles and its total population is 2,80,693 out of which almost half i.e. 49.8 per cent is Marathi-speaking and 35.5 per cent is Kannada-speaking. Out of 153 villages and towns about 86 villages and towns including the City of Belgaum are claimed by the Government of Maharashtra. The total area thereof comes to 220 sq. miles while the population affected is 2,20,389, the linguistic composition of which is 61 per cent Marathi-speaking, 23 per cent Kannada-speaking and 16 per cent others. Appendix IV shows the language composition of each village and town. It will be seen that in each of the 86 villages and towns claimed including the City of Belgaum the Marathi-speaking people form the largest single language group except those Kannada-speaking villages which form enclaves. This area is contiguous to the districts of Ratnagiri, Kolhapur and Sangli in the State of Maharashtra. The repeated expression of the will of the people of the disputed border areas is in favour of joining this area with the Maharashtra State. In all the elections

that have been held after 1956, candidates favouring transfer to Maharashtra have been returned with a thumping majority routing those who were in favour of continuance in the Mysore State. The following figures give the picture in detail :—

Taluka Development Board Elections, 1960

Name of Taluka	No. of seats	No. of seats contested by Maharashtra Ekikaran Samiti	No. of Samiti candidates elected
Belgaum	.. 19	16	13

Mysore Legislative Assembly Elections, 1957

Name of Constituency	No. of votes polled by Maharashtra Ekikaran Samiti candidate	No. of votes polled by the Congress	Excess of Samiti candidate's votes over Congress candidate's votes
Belgaum City	.. 22,179	15,915	6,264
Belgaum I	.. 18,016	12,063	5,953
Belgaum II	.. 17,446	15,549	1,897

Mysore Legislative Assembly Elections, 1962

Name of Constituency	No. of votes polled by the Maharashtra Ekikaran Samiti candidate	No. of votes polled by the Congress candidate	Excess of Samiti candidate's votes over Congress candidate's votes
Belgaum City	.. 27,643	13,614	14,029
Belgaum I	.. 17,778	13,312	4,466
Belgaum II	.. 18,505	17,592	913

For the 1967 elections, by the Delimitation of Parliamentary and Assembly Constituencies Order, 1965, for the State of Mysore the above three constituencies of the Belgaum taluka underwent considerable change. The revised extent of constituencies was as follows:—

Name of Constituency	Area
Belgaum	.. Belgaum Municipality.
Uchagaon	.. Belgaum taluka (excluding Belgaum Municipality and Bagewadi and Kakati Circles).
Bagewadi	.. Bagewadi and Kakati Circles in Belgaum taluka.

The changes made in the third constituency were such as to convert it from a Marathi majority constituency to a Kannada majority constituency. Naturally the candidate of the M. E. S. favouring transfer of Marathi majority areas to Maharashtra was not elected from the third constituency in 1967 elections as in the 1957 and 1962 elections. In the first two constituencies, however, the Maharashtra Ekikaran Samiti candidates were elected as in the 1957 and 1962 elections as can be seen from following results :—

Mysore Legislative Assembly Elections, 1967

Name of Constituency	No. of votes polled by the Maharashtra Ekikaran Samiti candidate	No. of votes polled by the Congress candidate	Excess of Samiti candidate's votes over Congress candidate's votes
Belgaum City	.. 27,818	24,224	3,594
Uchagaon	.. 28,063	10,546	17,520

Lok Sabha Elections, 1962

Name of Constituency	No. of votes polled by the candidate supported by Maharashtra Ekikaran Samiti	Votes polled by the Congress candidate	Difference
Belgaum City ..	28,294	13,607	14,687
Belgaum I ..	19,776	14,754	5,022
Belgaum II ..	18,913	12,184	6,729
Total ..	66,983	40,545	26,438

(*Note.*—The Belgaum South Lok Sabha Constituency consisted of eight Assembly Constituencies out of which three only were Marathi majority Constituencies. The above figures are in respect of the votes polled in those Constituencies.)

Apart from this, most of the village panchayats of concerned villages as also the Taluka Development Board have time and again passed resolutions expressing their desire that the villages should be transferred to Maharashtra. Similar resolution was passed by the Belgaum Municipality before it was superseded. The people of this area have also given vent to their feelings for transfer to Maharashtra through meetings, processions, demonstrations, morchas, satyagraha, no-tax campaign, etc.

The foregoing discussion amply proves that the area claimed on the basis of village as the unit has geographical contiguity with Maharashtra, relative linguistic majority and the inhabitants thereof have expressed consistently their keen desire to join the State of Maharashtra. Thus it satisfies all the four principles propounded by the Government of Maharashtra for readjustment of boundaries. In addition, educationally, socially, culturally and economically, this area is an integral part of Maharashtra.

Belgaum City

6.22. As regards the Belgaum city it has always been a Marathi-majority city (Appendix I, Map No. 4). The first Panch Committee for Belgaum was set up on the 1st December 1851 and a Municipality was set up in 1853. The records of the Panch Committee from 1851 as well as the records of the Municipality

from 1853 have all along been kept in Marathi. The first primary school started at Belgaum in 1830 was a Marathi school. Before the reorganisation of the States in 1956, there were 29 Marathi primary schools, 11 Kannada and 10 Urdu-Marathi primary schools in the Belgaum City. There were also seven high schools with Marathi medium, one with Kannada medium and six with both Marathi and Kannada media.

Economic Affiliations

6.23. The Belgaum City and the surrounding Marathi tract have vital economic connections with the important commercial centres of Maharashtra like Bombay, Poona, Kolhapur, Sangli, Ratnagiri, etc. and particularly with the marketing centres in the South Konkan which has no rail connection. Belgaum provides road communications and marketing facilities for export and import for the Ratnagiri district. The trade link with the Ratnagiri district is established by two routes—one *via* Kolhapur and the other *via* Sawantwadi and Vengurla. It is thus, a centre of transit trade for the Ratnagiri district.

6.24. Belgaum is the nerve centre of the trade of the Ratnagiri district. Malwan, Banda, Vengurla, Aronda, Shiroda and Sawantwadi from the Ratnagiri district depend for their requirements on Belgaum. When the sea route to Bombay is closed in the Monsoon they almost entirely depend on Belgaum. The petty traders from these Konkan areas depend on the wholesale merchants of Belgaum (and Khanapur). It is this business community which supported the precarious economy of Konkan by providing loans and advances, credits and transport facilities to the small traders and agriculturists of Konkan. The accounts and correspondence of these establishments are maintained in Marathi.

6.25. Belgaum and the surrounding Marathi area have trade relations with Ratnagiri, Goa and Karwar along routes which have existed from historical times and which still carry a substantial trade. Roads to Amboli, Tinai and Anshi ghats connect Belgaum with Ratnagiri, Goa and Karwar. The Belgaum-Amboli-Vengurla road carries a heavy traffic both in passenger and goods throughout

the year. Besides these roads, Ramghat, Choriaghat, Mangeli-ghat, Kelghat and other smaller ghats join Belgaum to the Ratnagiri district. Belgaum is joined to the region above the ghats by the Belgaum-Poona road which is one of the important national highways. The railway traffic between Poona and Belgaum as well as Sangli, Miraj and Belgaum is considerable. Similarly road traffic between Poona, Satara, Kolhapur and Belgaum is very heavy.

Weekly Bazaar

6.26. According to the Primary Census Abstract in the 1951 Census Hand-Book, Belgaum including Shahapur is the Bazar place for weekly bazars for 77 villages out of which 62 are from the Marathi tract and only 15 from the Kannada tract to the east of the Belgaum city.

District Headquarters

6.27. The Mysore Government have contested the claim mainly to the Belgaum city in this area. They contend that the Belgaum city has always been recognised as a part of Kannada area and was selected for the district headquarters in 1833 as other places in the district were found totally unsuitable. The Belgaum district as a whole which is predominantly Kannada-speaking area has been recognised as a part of Kannada area and the Government of Maharashtra do not dispute it. It is, however, not correct to infer therefrom that each part thereof, including the district headquarters individually, is recognised as a part and parcel of the Kannada area. Moreover, such a recognition is not logical in the context of adjustment of boundaries involving break up of the district. Likewise, the location of the headquarters of the district at Belgaum is attributable to the salubrious climate of the place for which the Britishers had a preference and to general administrative convenience. It must be recalled that the districts and even talukas of the British administrative system in these parts were in no sense organic entities. The existence of the Goa pocket, presence of several princely States of the South Maratha Country and the interposing of their villages with those of British India, resulted in the setting up of administrative districts and talukas which were not organic entities in any sense whether geographical, economic or cultural. The Kannada people when they first

demanding the formation of a Karnatak State, confined their demand only to the Kannada areas situated at the tail-end of both the provinces of Bombay and Madras. With the merger of the princely States, however, it became possible to have a new and larger State of Karnatak comprising not only the Kannada areas from the former provinces of Bombay and Madras but also Kannada areas from Hyderabad, other smaller princely States and the large and the prosperous princely State of Mysore. The inclusion of this Mysore State brought with it the important cities of Mysore and Bangalore. Bangalore has become the capital of this new State. As pointed out in paragraph 6.11 earlier even the Fact Finding Committee appointed by the princely State of Mysore in connection with the reorganisation of State did not lay claim to the Belgaum taluka including the Belgaum City. The objection that there was no capital town in the then proposed Karnatak, was the reason that led the leaders of Karnatak to lay claim to and include the city of Belgaum in their scheme of Karnatak State. That reason no longer exists.

6.28. The Government of Mysore have stated that the district and divisional offices of all the departments of the Karnatak region have been located in the Belgaum City, that the divisional headquarters of the State Road Transport Corporation and its workshop are also located at Belgaum, that a number of educational institutions have been established there, that the Belgaum District Local Board and the Belgaum District Co-operative Bank have constructed their offices at Belgaum and that there is no other suitable town to take the place of Belgaum in the event of its transfer to Maharashtra. It is also stated by that Government that the value of these properties is very considerable.

A similar situation had arisen when the State of Andhra was formed in 1953 and the State of Madhya Pradesh was reorganised in 1956. Suitable places were found for the capital of these two States and for necessary administrative and other offices. In comparison, the problem that might be posed if Belgaum is transferred to Maharashtra, would be very much simpler. In the course of the States Reorganisation, principles have been evolved for sharing of assets and liabilities in such contingencies. A formula

has thus been evolved to provide adequate safeguards. In this connection, the Government of Mysore and its representatives have further contended that Belgaum is not only the headquarters for Government work but also a centre for a number of private Kannada educational, co-operative and other institutions. While it may be possible to divide the assets of such institutions on the basis of certain principles, the functioning and continuance of these institutions is likely to be jeopardised as a result of separation of the Belgaum City from the Kannada areas for which they cater. This is not a problem peculiar to the Belgaum city. Every city affected as a result of reorganisation has had similar problem. They do not present any insurmountable difficulties. It should not also be difficult to find a suitable alternative place as the district and divisional headquarters when alternative capitals could be found for the States of Madhya Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Punjab and Haryana. In fact, Shri A. D. Gorwala in his report on the Mysore Administration has considered Bagalkot to be natural headquarters for this division. It is pertinent to note that when Belgaum was selected as district headquarters, Ankalgi, Gokak, Murgod and Manali were all proposed and at one time Gokak was almost determined on. The Collector pointed out the disadvantages likely to arise from the headquarters being fixed at any place other than Belgaum and at length persuaded Government to adopt his views. It is thus clear that apart from Belgaum, there are other places such as Gokak and now even Ghataprabha which are centrally situated and can be considered for district headquarters.

Marathi Literary Conference of 1929

6.29. Much capital is being made out by the Mysore Government and their representatives of the statement made by Shri N. C. Kelkar in 1929 after the Marathi Literary Conference. It is therefore necessary to review the context in which the statement was made.

The Karnatak Unification Sabha comprising Kannada-speaking people belonging to all political parties as well as social and economic groups, had been set up by about 1917. The Karnatak Provincial Congress Committee as well as the Karnatak

Unification Sabha started working together for realising their common objective of having a unified Karnatak State. They held conferences, led deputations, raised questions in the State Assemblies of Madras and Bombay and the Central Assembly in support of this demand. As the princely States had not been merged with the rest of India, the two organisations had to confine their demand for a Karnatak Province to Kannad areas in British India only. There was no capital town in this area and that was one of the objections raised against this demand. The Belgaum city, though not the capital of a Province, was the headquarters of a Division, an important Military station and a centre of trade, commerce and education. It was a Marathi-majority town but near the border of Kannada-speaking area. The United Karnataka Sabha and the Karnatak Provincial Congress Committee laid claim, therefore, to the whole district of Belgaum including the city of Belgaum for inclusion in the proposed Karnatak State. This claim was officially put forth by them through their publication "United Karnatak", dated the 20th September 1928. This created apprehensions in the minds of the Marathi-speaking people of the Belgaum city who did not claim the whole of the district of Belgaum as part of Maharashtra but claimed only the Belgaum city and the Marathi-speaking areas in the Belgaum taluka. It resulted in tension amongst the two linguistic groups of the Belgaum city and led to a bitter controversy in which charges and countercharges were made by both the groups against each other.

6.30. The Karnatak Unification Sabha invited their Fourth Conference to meet at Belgaum in May 1929. The Marathi Literary Conference had also been invited to hold its session at Belgaum in the same month. This increased tension at Belgaum. Shri D. V. Belvi, a nationalist leader of the time, was the Chairman of the Reception Committee of the Karnatak Unification Conference and Shri Shivaram Mahadeo Paranjpe, a nationalist leader was the President-elect of the Marathi Literary Conference. It was attended by Shri N. C. Kelkar. Many of those concerned with the two Conferences were prominent leaders in the public life of the country and of the Congress Organisation. Some Kannada-speaking people raised objection to the very holding of the Marathi

Literary Conference at Belgaum on the alleged ground that it was an attempt on the part of the Marathi-speaking people to drag *the whole district of Belgaum* into Maharashtra. Threats and counter-threats followed in the press and on the platform. Tension reached its climax. Shri D. V. Belvi, Chairman of the Reception Committee of the Karnatak Unification Conference, issued a public appeal in March 1929, to remove misunderstanding and clear the unhealthy atmosphere at Belgaum. In that appeal he said:—

“I have not the slightest doubt about the honesty of my Kannada brethren who have criticised me and the Maharashtra Sahitya Sammelan to be held at Belgaum. It is true and natural that all these critics should be proud of the Kannada language ; but they have all been victims of mis-understanding and mis-apprehension. I believe that the basis of the disorder at present rife in Karnatak is the mis-understanding that the conveners of the Sahitya Sammelan at Belgaum have in their mind the ulterior motive of snatching the *Belgaum district* for Maharashtra. When eight or nine years ago the Congress organised the provinces on the linguistic basis, no leader of Maharashtra said that the *Belgaum district* should be included in Maharashtra.... If any Maharashtrian leader says so, I will strongly oppose him. Now let us consider a little the invitation for convening the Maharashtra Sahitya Sammelan at Belgaum. The mother-tongue of more than one-third of the population of the Belgaum district is Marathi. The population of the district is approximately ten lakhs. The population of Belgaum city is about forty thousand, of whom *those who can read and write Marathi outnumber the Kannadigas at present. All the trade of Belgaum is conducted mostly in Marathi....* Some of my Kannada brothers have used strong words in their criticism. I think it proper, however, to abide by the good advice given in the issue of the Karmaveer dated 20th April 1928 to the effect that it is not necessary to reply to things which are defamatory, vilifying or of like nature. I am of opinion that my Kannad brothers should not use evil words like—the Maharashtrians hatch a conspiracy they resort to deliberately misleading tactics, etc. *It is a fact that most Marathas cannot read or write Kannad.* It should, therefore, suffice to say that it is improper to vilify them.... I am

a Kannadiga.... I too am proud of Karnatak and the Kannada language....I have been serving Karnatak sincerely according to my little light....I request all my brothers in Karnatak to end this wordy warfare now....” (English version of the letter in Marathi published in columns 1 and 2 on page 3 of “Kesari” dated the 19th March 1929).

6.31. In such an atmosphere, the Marathi Literary Conference was held on the 26th, 27th and 28th of May 1929. All the leaders were anxious to relieve the tension in national interest. It was a difficult situation for Congressmen who had been divided. Both the Conferences passed off without any untoward incident. The question over which Congressmen had been divided was not a question for immediate solution. The first and foremost question before the leaders of the Congress was one of attainment of freedom. Division amongst Congressmen on the language issue had to be avoided. It was inadvisable to allow such questions to be raised at that time. The territorial extent of linguistic States or provinces if and when created was not an immediate question. It could be tackled at the appropriate time. Restoring amity between the two sections was the immediate problem; with this background, after the Conference, leaders of the Congress issued three statements. One was issued by Shri S. M. Paranjpe, President of the Marathi Literary Conference, and 14 other Maharashtrian Congressmen. The other was issued by Kannad Congressmen Shri B. N. Datar and 16 others and the third was issued by Shri N. C. Kelkar, Shri D. V. Belvi and two others. The burden of these statements was to thank all the people, both Kannadigas and Maharashtrians, for avoiding any untoward incidents during the period of these Conferences. One of such statements was the statement of Shri N. C. Kelkar and three other leaders. The statement was regarding *the Belgaum District as a whole and not pertaining to the city* and was therefore a statement issued in a different context and for a different purpose.

Linguistic Composition

6.32. The Mysore Government have challenged even the linguistic considerations on the basis of which the Belgaum city is claimed by the Government of Maharashtra. According to them the

higher percentage of the Marathi-speaking population is due to immigration. In support of this statement they have not given the linguistic composition of the city in the previous years.

In 1901, 65 per cent of the people of the Belgaum district spoke Kannada and 25 per cent spoke Marathi. In 1951, these figures were 64·3 per cent and 26·5 per cent. Obviously, the linguistic composition of the population remained virtually unchanged, indicating that there are stable and not merely transitional elements in it. The negligible increase was due to the merger of the Maratha Princely States like Kurundwad-Senior and Junior, Sangli, Jamkhindi, etc. in 1948 in the Belgaum district. The Government of Mysore contend that the language slips of the 1951 census if resorted with reference to the birth-place, the result will be as follows:—

Languages	Total population		Born in the State of Mysore and in Chandgad taluka	
	Actual	Percentage	Actual	Percentage
Marathi ..	61,999	51·6	52,315	49·8
Kannada and others ..	58,220	48·4	52,666	50·2
Total ..	1,20,219	100·00	1,04,981	100·00

No such authoritative resorting has taken place and the figures are not therefore authentic. Even then it is interesting to note that the Mysore Government have conveniently grouped the Kannadigas and others together. If the Kannadigas and others are shown separately the figures are as follows:—

Language	Total population		Born in the State of Mysore and in Chandgad Taluka	
	Actual	Percentage	Actual	Percentage
Marathi ..	62,408	51·6	52,130	49·8
Kannada ..	27,448	22·8	N.A.	N.A.
Others ..	30,676	25·5	N.A.	N.A.
Unspecified ..	87	00·1	N.A.	N.A.
Total ..	1,20,219	100·00	1,04,981	100·00

(N.A.=Not available)

(The figures in columns 2 and 3 are based on the Census of India 1951 Language Hand book for Kanara and Belgaum Districts)

Even if the entire Kannad-speaking population (27,448) is eated as locally born, though this is most unlikely, it is about half of the locally born Marathi-speaking population (52,135). Apart from this, Konkani-speaking population included in the category 'others' has to be grouped with Marathi-speaking population. The percentage of the Marathi speaking population will thus be higher. The statement of Shri Belvi made in 1929 and quoted in paragraph 6·30 earlier shows that even at that time those who could read and write Marathi outnumbered the Kannadigas in Belgaum city. The extract from the Census of India, 1951 quoted in paragraph 6·15 earlier reveals that 41,422 persons born in the Belgaum district were enumerated in the Kolhapur district as against only 34,110 born in the Kolhapur district and enumerated in the Belgaum district. Obviously, therefore, the trend of migration appears to be contrary to what is claimed by the Government of Mysore.

Comparison of Belgaum with Bellary

6.33. The Mysore Government have stated that the percentage of the locally born Marathi-speaking population in the Belgaum city is considerably less than the locally born Telugu population in the Bellary town and if Bellary's higher Telugu population was not sufficient to justify its inclusion in Andhra, the case of Maharashtra for Belgaum is more tenuous and that, despite this palpably weak case, if the claim of Maharashtra were to be conceded, the stronger case of Bellary would inevitably have to be reopened.

It is not known on what authority the above statement has been made. From the figures given by Shri Justice L. S. Misra in paragraphs 10 and 12 of his Report on the Bellary taluka, the composition of the population of Bellary town was as follows:—

	Total population	Kannada	Telugu	Others
Bellary town ..	70,463	17,333 (24·6)	23,033 (32·7)	30,097 (42·7)

6.34. After deducting the floating population of persons who were brought in temporarily into the revenue circles in connection with the construction of the low level canals of the Tungabhadra

Project or into the Bellary town for administrative purposes, the composition of the population of the Bellary revenue circle including the Bellary town was as follows:—

	Total population	Kannada	Telugu	Others
Bellary Revenue circle including Bellary Town.	76,873	24,782 (32·24)	21,273 (27·67)	30,818 (40·09)

6.35. Taking both these sets of figures, it will be seen that the percentage of the locally-born Marathi-speaking persons in the Belgaum city (49·8) is much higher than that of the Telugu-speaking persons in the Bellary town (27·67). If Bellary could go to the Mysore State on the basis of merely 32·24 per cent locally born Kannad-speaking population, it is more logical that the Belgaum city with 49·8 per cent locally born Marathi-speaking population should go to Maharashtra.

6.36. Mysore's contention that the mother tongue figures in the 1951 Census are not reliable is dealt with in paragraph 4·20 earlier. It will be seen therefrom that there is absolutely no doubt about the correctness of the mother tongue figures, though figures about bilingualism which are not relevant here, may not be excessively accurate.

Maratha Light Infantry

6.37. Mysore Government have contended that the Maratha Infantry Centre was located in Belgaum as the Chief Military Station in Karnatak, on strategic grounds, suitability of climate, etc. and not on linguistic consideration. They argue that there are Maratha regiments at Ahmedabad and Assam, while Punjabi Units are to be found in the South and if the language were the main criterion, the unit would have been either in Poona or in Satara. The base of an infantry regimental Centre and posting of its units are entirely different things. The units can be and are located anywhere in the country, irrespective of the main centre where basically recruiting and training facilities are provided. The examples cited, being of the postings of units

are irrelevant. Apart from strategic grounds and suitability of climate, recruitment potential is an important factor relevant for the location of a base. It is a historically admitted fact that Marathas are a martial race. Rulers, whoever they may be, have drawn upon this race freely for recruitment in the army. This martial race is thickly spread throughout the belts stretching from Belgaum to Satara, Belgaum to Ratnagiri and Belgaum to Karwar. Belgaum has thus been a convenient central place for recruiting Maratha soldiers from its neighbouring Marathi areas. This is the reason why Belgaum was chosen to be the centre of the Maratha Light Infantry. It may be added that a military school for children of Jawans is also established at this very centre for the simple reason that these children would be coming for training from places around Belgaum e.g. Ratnagiri, Vengurla, Sawantwadi, Karad, Satara, Kolhapur, Poona, etc.

Assuming for the sake of argument, as suggested by the Mysore Government, that the Maratha Light Infantry Regiment Centre was located in Belgaum by accident and could have been located anywhere else in the country, the position regarding Marathi-majority would not be different. If all floating military population is to be excluded, logically the population of the whole of cantonment area will have to be excluded. If this is done, the percentage of Marathi-speaking people becomes higher rather than lower as will be seen from the following table :—

	Population			Percentage	
	Total	Marathi	Kannad	Marathi	Kannad
Belgaum city including cantonment area.	1,20,219	62,008	27,448	51·57	22·83
Belgaum city excluding cantonment area.	1,03,543	54,741	25,685	52·87	24·81

Official Language

6.38. According to the Government of Mysore, all the records in the offices of the Mamlatdar, the Collector, the Land Records Department and the Village Officers and Police had been maintained

in Kannada only. Even after the merger of the Deccan States, by Resolution No. 2026/46, dated the 17th May 1950 (Appendix III-3) the Government of Bombay directed that, as far as the Belgaum district was concerned, the official language should be Kannada in all talukas, mahals and petas except Shahapur which was declared a bilingual area as it was a part of the former Sangli State.

According to the report of the Collector of Belgaum, dated the 12th September 1950 (attached as Appendix III-4), official records in the following talukas and mahals were maintained in the languages shown against them :—

Taluka or Mahal	Languages in which official record is maintained
Chikodi English, Marathi and Kannada.
Belgaum English, Marathi and Kannada.
Khanapur..	.. English, Marathi and Kannada.
Shahapur Marathi.
Chandgad..	.. English and Marathi.

The Mysore Government's contention that the records were kept in Kannada only is not correct as they were kept in the languages mentioned above and the same position continued upto the reorganisation of the States. As regards the official language of the Belgaum district except the Shahapur taluka, an extract from the demi-official letter dated the 9th June 1950 from the then Chief Minister of Bombay to the then Minister for Works, Mines and Power, Government of India, New Delhi, is given below :—

“ As regards Belgaum Taluka and other Talukas in Belgaum District, where there is a substantial proportion of the Marathi-speaking people, the matter is still under consideration, and the same principle will be followed in the case of these areas also.”

Immediately thereafter i.e. as far back July 1950, the then Government of Bombay had taken a decision to declare the Belgaum taluka as bilingual after ascertaining the language composition of population of the Belgaum taluka as well as the language of the official records. Orders to this effect were however to be issued simultaneously with the orders in respect of other talukas in respect

of which the question was under consideration. Thereafter, the matter of issue of orders came to be successively linked up with the reformation of Belgaum taluka in 1950, the availability of fresh census figures and finally with the Official Language Bill for the State. Ultimately, the preorganised State never enacted the Official Language Act even upto the date of the reorganisation of the States with the result that the orders issued in the Government Resolution dated the 17th May 1950 were never actually modified though it was decided to do so as far back as July 1950. Apart from this, the then Government of Bombay in a press note issued on the 26th June 1950 had clarified that recognition of regional languages for official purpose had no political significance nor was it redolent of the linguistic position of the areas in question. The above position clearly shows that the inference drawn by the Government of Mysore and their representatives is not correct.

Municipality of Belgaum

6.39. The Mysore Government attach no importance to the overwhelming majority of the Marathi-speaking Councillors in the Belgaum Municipality since its inception on the ground that the elections were not fought on linguistic issue. At best, this could be correct upto the date of reorganisation of the States. Since then, the atmosphere of the Belgaum city has been so surcharged with linguistic issue that it is difficult to conceive by any stretch of imagination that elections to such an important body could be on any issue other than linguistic. Even the representatives of the Mysore Government have admitted that the municipality was under the control of Marathi elements over a considerable period. Suspension of the Belgaum Municipality, which repeatedly passed resolutions for transfer to Maharashtra and not holding fresh elections in spite of the repeated demands from the people to that effect is the best commentary on the situation. Even assuming that the elections were not fought on linguistic grounds, the membership of an elected body generally reflects the composition of the population which it represents. The repeated election of Marathi-speaking Councillors by an overwhelming majority, therefore, is a clear indication of the predominance of the Marathi-speaking people in the Belgaum city.

General Library and Merchants' Association

6.40. The Mysore Government have contended that the General Library and the Merchants' Chamber, where elections are being fought on linguistic lines show the domination of Kannada-speaking people. It may be mentioned that out of the 15 members of the managing committee of the General Library, 13 members have been Marathi-speaking whereas only two have been Kannada-speaking ever since 1957-58. Neither the number of Kannada-speaking members nor the number of books in Kannada stand any comparison with those of Marathi-speaking members and Marathi books. As regards the domination in the Merchants' Association, the number of Kannada-speaking members has never been more than six in an elected body of 27 representatives from 1956-57 to 1960-61, while the number of Marathi-speaking members during the same period has been at least 15. At present the number of Marathi-speaking members has increased to 17 while the number of Kannada-speaking members is only five. Out of the total number of 269 ordinary members at present, 146 are Marathi-speaking and only 71 are Kannada-speaking. The Mysore Government's contention that Kannada-speaking people have dominated these two institutions is wholly untrue and the composition of these bodies even at present do have a positive majority of Marathi-speaking people.

Age old language and communities

6.41. The Mysore Government's contention that the Marathi language is mostly confined to the Marathas, the Chitpavan and Karhada Brahmins is not substantiated by that Government. A glance at the following extracts from the *Belgaum District Gazetteer, 1884* will show that the facts are otherwise :—

“GUJARAT BRAHMANS, of three sub-divisions Nagar Shrimali, and Pokarna are found in Chikodi and Belgaum where some Gujarat Vanis and Bhatias are settled. Their home speech is Gujarati and they speak Marathi in public.”

“SHENVIS, are found chiefly in the Belgaum and Khanapur sub-division. Both men and women speak Marathi and occasionally Kanarese. At home they speak the Konkani language

which they brought from Goa, though the accent has been changed to a Kanarese accent, and a good many Kanarese words have been added."

"KAYASHTH PRABHUS, are found chiefly in Belgaum and Chikodi. They speak Marathi and have no separate dialect."

"BANDEKARS, that is people of Bandivade a village in Goa, are found in most large towns except Parasgad, Gokak, and Athani. All speak Marathi with many Konkani peculiarities like those of the Shenvis."

"GUJARAT VANIS, generally called Gujar Vanis, are scattered over the district and are settled in large numbers in Chikodi. Their home tongue is Gujarati mixed with Hindustani, and besides their home tongue most of them speak both Hindustani and Marathi."

"NARVEKARS, or inhabitants of Narve in Goa, are found in Khanapur, Belgaum, Sampagaon, Chikodi, and Parasgad. They speak Konkani-Marathi."

"GURAVS, are found chiefly in Athani, Chikodi, and Gokak. The home speech of most of the Guravs is Kanarese, but those in *Khanapur, Belgaum and Chikodi* speak Marathi."

"HANBARS, are found all over the district. They are numerous in the hilly tracts of Belgaum, Khanapur, and Chikodi. Their home tongue is Marathi."

"KAMATHIS, are found only in Belgaum. They look like Marathas and speak Telugu at home and Marathi out of doors."

"KULMARS, or Iron-workers, from Kulume the Kanarese for a forge, are found in Khanapur and Sampagaon. They have no sub-divisions and speak Marathi."

"KUNBIS, are found in the Athani, Belgaum, Chikodi, and Khanapur sub-divisions. They speak Konkani, the common speech in the neighbouring sub-division of Supa in North Kanara and in Goa. The Marathi or Kulvadi Kunbis seem to have come from the Marathi-speaking districts of the Deccan. Their home speech is Marathi."

"MITH-GAVDAS, or SALT-MEN, are found in Chikodi only. They look like Kunbis and speak Marathi in their homes."

The above list is illustrative and not exhaustive. There are also a number of other communities such as Deshasthas, Gholaks, Chambhars, etc. which speak both Marathi and Kannada languages.

Character of City

6.42. The Mysore Government have attempted to prove the Kannad character of the city by reference to the names of streets and temples. Streets are named as Gullies, entrances of the city as Ves and squares as Chowks or Khoots or Khind, e.g. Gondhaligalli, Chavatgalli, Marutigalli, Kamatgalli, Sarafgalli, Kacherigalli, etc., Bogarves, Kakatives, Goaves, Vadgaonves, etc., Shaniwarkhoot, Yandekhoot, etc., Kakeruchowk, Ramlingkhind, etc. These names will at once prove that they are purely Marathi terms. Out of 111 streets, within the limits of the Belgaum Borough Municipality, 87 have Marathi names as against 24 with Kannad names ; 'June' (old) Belgaum is a small place near Belgaum. The word 'June' is a Marathi word.

The following is the list of temples in the city which are endowed with Inams or Grants from the former rulers which continue even to this day:—

Name of Temple	Managed by	Priest
1. Vajjnath Marathi people ..	Marathi.
2. Chandramahabaleshwar
3. Kapileshwar
4. Ramling
5. Bhairav Deo
6. Laxmidevi
7. Kalamma Devi
8. Jathi Math
9. Maruti
10. Kapileshwar Bairaji Math
11. Kate Yellemma Kannad People ..	Kannad.
12. Jangamdhupad Dev
13. Shri Mendikol

Out of the total number of 98 temples in the Belgaum Borough Municipal area deities of the 66 temples are those which are mainly worshipped by Maharashtrians.

Marathi Periodicals

The oldest dailies, weeklies, and magazines of the Belgaum city are all Marathi e.g. Belgaum Samachar is being published for the last 97 years and Tarun Bharat for 75 years. They have large circulation. Similarly the Marathi periodicals indented from outside far out-number those in Kannada. Belgaum has nine cinema theatres, one of which is exclusively for exhibition of Marathi films whereas others exhibit Hindi, Marathi or English pictures. The Kannada and Tamil pictures are exhibited occasionally. Apart from this, the Maharashtrian character of the city will be evident even from a casual visit to the bazar. The signboards, advertisements, etc. are mainly in Marathi. The commercial community has adopted Marathi as their business language obviously because it is the language understood by most of the residents. Out of 269 members of the Belgaum Merchants' Association hardly 8 to 10 members maintain their accounts in Kannad and the rest keep their accounts in Marathi. More or less this was the position all these years as can be seen from Shri Belvi's statement quoted in paragraph 6.30 earlier.

6.43. The Mysore Government's denial that the Patils and hereditary officers are not Marathi-speaking is not borne out by facts. The original Patil family of Belgaum is a Marathi-speaking family holding office from historical times. The Patil family of Hosur which was a majra of Belgaum is Jain by caste and is a Marathi-speaking family. Among Kulkarnis of Belgaum and Hosur some representative vatandars are Marathi-speaking. Half the number of Chougulas is Marathi-speaking and rest are Jains who carry on their day-to-day affairs in Marathi. Of the 12 Sanadis, six are Marathi-speaking, four Muslims and only two are Kannad-speaking. Gramopadhyes are all Marathi-speaking people. The pargana Vatandars who possess Inam lands at Belgaum are only four, viz., (1) Desai of Jamboti, (2) Nadgouda of Ambewadi, (3) Deshpande of Kardeguddi and (4) Sardesai of Wantmuri. Of these the first three are Marathi-speaking and are residents of Belgaum and only Sardesai of Wantmuri is Kannadi-speaking and resides at Wantmuri. As far as this Government is aware, there is no record to show that Kanungo was a Watandar family.

Economic Affinity

6.44. It has been clarified in paragraph 6-18(b) earlier that there can be no dispute about the incorrectness of the State Reorganisation Commission's statement that Belgaum is the centre for trade in cotton and oilseeds. As regards the Mysore Government's contention that Belgaum is actually not the entrepot for the South Konkan below the Ghats, it has already been explained in paragraphs 6.23 to 6.25 earlier, how the Marathi-speaking tract has close economic affiliation with the Belgaum city, as the entrepot for the tract of the South Konkan below the Ghats. Even the representatives of the Government of Mysore have conceded that the trade connections between Vengurla and Belgaum have developed since the 19th century.

6.45. The Mysore Government have contended that Belgaum is really an outlet for merchandise such as foodgrains, fruits, cereals, jaggery, spices, edible oils, fuel, charcoal, timber, butter, ghee, cotton seeds, and oil cakes, from the undisputed Kannad areas of that district and the districts of the Karwar, Bijapur and Dharwar. This argument is not correct. No facts and figures in its support have been given. As a matter of fact the Dharwar district has its own markets such as Hubli, Byadgi, Gadag, Ranebennur, etc. That district hardly depends upon the Belgaum market. It may be noted that the Belgaum-Dharwar road is the only means of communication for such trade. The income from Octroi Naka on this road collected by the Belgaum Municipality by way of octroi duties will serve as a reliable indicator of the volume of trade by that road. In no year has this income exceeded 10 per cent of the total octroi income of the Municipality. Moreover, about 30 to 35 miles of this road starting from Belgaum lies within the Belgaum district itself and the bulk of the trade on this road is with this area in the district. As regards the Karwar district the communication lines are the Belgaum-Karwar road and the Belgaum-Sadashivgad road. These roads pass through the talukas of Haliyal and Karwar and Supa peta, which are Marathi areas. The rest of the Karwar district has Hubli as the centre of trade which is much nearer to them than Belgaum. As for some eastern talukas of the Belgaum district, the import of the articles mentioned by the Government of Mysore is very low as compared

with the import of those articles from Maharashtra and non-Karnatak area. The following details supplied by the Belgaum Municipality will bear out the facts:—

Rice and paddy are imported from the Marathi areas of the Belgaum, Khanapur, Haliyal and Chandgad talukas and Supa peta. The quantity that comes from Kannad area (Kittur) in the Belgaum district is very small. Rice of finer qualities is imported from Bezwada in Andhra to a limited extent.

Wheat is imported from Punjab and foreign countries and to a small extent from Bailhongal.

Jawar is imported mainly from Barsi and also from Sholapur Pandharpur, Davangere, Gokak and Bailhongal.

Bajri is imported from Barsi, Poona side and to some extent from Gokak.

Nachana (Ragi) is imported from Marathi areas of Belgaum, Khanapur and Chandgad.

Pulses are imported from Barsi, Kanpur, Hyderabad, Punjab, Nasik, Nagar, Sholapur, etc.

Fruits worth about six lakhs of rupees are imported. Three-fourths of the quantity is imported from Maharashtra i.e. Neera, Poona, Nagar, Baramati, Phaltan, Barsi, Latur, Nasik, etc. About one-fifth is imported from Northern India i.e. Delhi, Amritsar, Mirzapur, etc. and only one-sixteenth or so comes from Karnatak i.e. Chikmagalur and Bangalore. Belgaum is one of the important marketing centres for mangoes grown in Ratnagiri district.

Jaggery (Gur) is brought from the Marathi areas of the Belgaum, Khanapur and Chandgad talukas and from the Nipani and Kolhapur and in recent years only to a small extent from Mugutkhan Hubli area. Out of 90 lakhs-rupee worth jaggery that is imported in Belgaum, only 5 lakhs-rupee worth comes from Kannad areas.

Spices come from Cochin and Bombay.

Edible Oils are extracted locally. Import of edible oils is comparatively low and is from Cochin, Karnool, Hyderabad, Bombay, Bailhongal and Davangere.

Oil Cakes mainly come from Karnool and Hyderabad.

Fuel, Charcoal and Timber are imported from the forest areas of Belgaum, Khanapur, Haliyal, Supa, Chandgad and Amboli which are Marathi areas.

Butter and Ghee are imported both from Marathi and Kannad areas of the district. No imports are made either from the Dharwar or Karwar district.

6.46. It is stated by the Government of Mysore that Belgaum is not an industrial city and there are no articles of local manufacture for export. Belgaum may not be a big manufacturing city like Bombay, but it has its own industries. Some of the important industries in this city are (1) Groundnut oil, (2) Hosiery, (3) Copper and Brass pots and Brass casting, (4) Silk thread, (5) Weaving—particularly saree weaving, (6) Soap, (7) Silver and Gold articles, (8) Leather goods, (9) Tanning, (10) Furniture works, (11) Iron casting and (12) Ghee. Most of the industries like brass casting and manufacturing subsidiary parts have entered into contracts with key industries in Maharashtra like Cooper and Kirloskar. Articles manufactured here are exported to Bombay, Poona, Nasik, Kolhapur, etc. and also to some extent to other places in India. Konkan tract such as Ratnagiri district mainly depends on this city for finished articles.

6.47. That the commercial contacts of Belgaum are more intimate with the Marathi districts can be seen from the income from the different octroi nakas of the Belgaum city. A statement showing the octroi collections for the year 1954-55 to 1959-60 prepared by the Belgaum Municipality prior to its supersession is attached as Appendix VI (1). In this statement nakas have been classified as Marathi or Kannad depending on the area from which the goods are imported through that naka. It is clear therefrom that the average annual collection on goods coming from Kannad areas was Rs. 3,17,887 while those on goods coming from Marathi areas amounted to Rs. 1,06,63,375. The Mysore Government and their representatives contend that the nakas should be classified as Marathi, Kannad and mixed nakas because there are some nakas where the goods received are from both Kannada as well as Marathi areas. They further suggest that mixed nakas and nakas on which

goods are received through railway, or post parcels should be excluded for the purpose of comparing octroi collections from Marathi and Kannad areas. The main difference is about the classification of nakas and exclusion of octroi receipts on goods received through railway or post or by way of adjustments made in the municipal office. There is no difference of opinion about the Dharwar, Supplementary Dharwar and Kasai nakas being clasified as Kannad and the Vengurla, Bogarves and Ramghat nakas bseing classified as Marathi nakas. Though the Mysore Government had classified the Vaccine Depot naka and the Kapleshwar (Vadgaon) naka as mixed nakas subsequently their representatives have conceded that they may be classified as Marathi nakas. The dispute thus remains only about the remaining seven nakas, the position in respect of which is as follows :—

Kaladgi and Kaktives nakas.—The Government of Maharashtra have classified them as Marathi nakas. The Government of Mysore and their representatives have however, classified them as Kannad nakas on the ground that the main road from Belgaum to Kolhapur which is connected to these nakas passes through Kannad areas and touches Kannad villages such as Sutgatti, Hattargi, etc. This argument is not convincing as it is not shown that these villages are capable of exporting anything. Further the goods received at these nakas arrive mostly from Bombay and Kolhapur by trucks. The octroi collections of Kaladgi and Kaktives nakas during 1959-60 were Rs. 1,53,971 and Rs. 64,007 respectively. It is obvious that the Kannad villages contiguous to the road do not export goods octroi on which can be of this order. The nakas have therefore to be classified as Marathi only.

Nagazari, Shahapur and Khanapur nakas.—The Government of Maharashtra have classified these nakas as Marathi. The Government of Mysore and their representatives have classified them as mixed nakas on the ground that on the Khanapur road, to which these nakas are connected, lie important places of Khanapur and Nandgad where Marathi-speaking people are not in absolute majority and also Bidi which is admittedly a Kannad village. This argument is not convincing as places like Khanapur,

Nandgad and Bidi cannot be taken in isolation for considering such trade because goods come from all over Khanapur taluka which is predominantly Marathi-speaking. Besides goods come to this naka from the Karwar and Haliyal talukas and Supa peta also which are all Marathi areas.

Khasbhag naka.—The Government of Maharashtra have classified this naka as Marathi. The Government of Mysore and their representatives have classified it as a mixed naka on the grounds that the roads passing in front of it cannot be said to proceed either exclusively to Marathi or Kannada areas and the naka is supposed to act as a check naka for the Dharwar naka. This naka is classified as Marathi naka because it is a check naka for Kapileshwar (Vadgaon) naka, which has been accepted as Marathi naka.

Hosur naka.—The Government of Mysore and their representatives classified this naka as a mixed naka on the ground that it is a moving naka. This is not correct because this naka commands the Belgaum-Vadgaon-Yellur Road which passes through Marathi region. It has to be accepted as a Marathi naka.

The Mysore Government and their representatives have contended that the octroi in respect of goods received by railway (entries Patil-ves, Goods shed) and post parcels should not be taken as it is not possible to attribute them to goods coming from Marathi or Kannad areas. The Belgaum Municipality has however certified that 80 per cent of goods received by railway come from Bombay side and as such they have to be treated as Marathi nakas. The Mysore Government, on the basis of commoditywise classification of octroi receipts, had contended that most of the goods received by railway are imported from Northern India. Out of 80 per cent goods received from Bombay only one-fourth come from Northern India and the rest from Bombay and the rest of Maharashtra. This will be seen from as the articles received by railway which are textiles, woollen-goods, petrol and petroleum products, medicines, machinery, cigarettes and bidi, metal goods, kerosene oil, paints and colours, spices, electrical material, crockery, stationery, leather goods, hardware, silk and art silk,

cycle parts, rubber goods, toilet goods, coconut oils etc. When these articles are locally available in Bombay, it is unlikely that the hardheaded business community would import them from far off places which would result in increasing the cost.

6.48. The fact that Belgaum is the bazar centre for 62 Marathi-speaking villages as against 15 Kannad-speaking villages is tried to be explained away by the Mysore Government by a simple statement to the effect that the fate of these villages is still hanging in the balance. The explanation is fallacious as the linguistic composition of these villages as revealed in the 1951 census is beyond doubt.

Language of Agricultural Produce Market Committee

6.49. The representatives of the Mysore Government have stated that with the sanction of Government Kannad has been adopted as the language of the Agricultural Produce Market Committee, Belgaum in 1955. This shows that the language easily understood by agriculturists, with which the Committee has particularly to deal with, is Kannada and not Marathi. This is not correct. As the Committee is appointed by Government the language adopted is naturally the official language of the area. The official language of the area was declared as Kannada by G. R., P. & S. D., No. 2026/46, dated the 17th May 1950 (Appendix III-3). It has already been explained in paragraph 6.38 earlier that though a decision was taken to amend the G. R. immediately after it was issued, why orders could not be issued. The numerous extracts from the District Gazetteer quoted in paragraph 6.41 earlier make it clear that the language of most of the agricultural communities was Marathi even as far back as in 1874. Besides, the majority of the elected members of this Committee are at present Marathi-speaking.

6.50. The representatives of the Mysore Government have stated that the schools first started by the London Missionary Society were Kannada. It may be pointed out that the first Marathi school was started in 1830 i.e. at least twenty years before the Kannada school was started. The number of Marathi educational institutions in the Belgaum city has always been higher than that of similar Kannad institutions.

Summary

6.51. The above discussion is summarised below:—

(a) that the Belgaum city is contiguous to the Marathi-speaking tract;

(b) that the Marathi-speaking people are in absolute majority in the Belgaum city;

(c) that social and cultural affinity (qualitatively and quantitatively) is overwhelmingly with Marathi-speaking people of Maharashtra and that the city is Maharashtrian in character;

(d) that the number of primary and secondary schools shows that substantially larger number of children go to Marathi schools than to Kannada schools;

(e) that the economic affiliations are with Maharashtra;

(f) that all the elections to Legislature, Municipality and non-official bodies so far contested have been won by the Marathi-speaking candidates;

(g) that the wishes of the people have been unequivocally expressed on a number of occasions in favour of inclusion in Maharashtra.

6.52. As regards the remaining areas in Belgaum taluka claimed by the Government of Maharashtra, the representatives of Mysore have contested the claim on the grounds that these areas are part of Karnatak as the title of the District Gazetteer is 'Bombay Gazetteer—Karnatak' and that the nine villages to the East of Belgaum city have no contiguity with remaining areas. The District Gazetteer is titled as 'Gazetteer of the Bombay Presidency—Volume XXI—Belgaum' though the pages inside it, bear at the top the words 'Bombay Gazetteer—Karnatak'. It has never been disputed by the Government of Maharashtra that the Belgaum district as a whole is predominantly Kannad and as such the gazetteer must have been called as 'Bombay Gazetteer—Karnatak'. The Gazetteer for the Kanara district (1884) is entitled 'Bombay Gazetteer—Konkan'. Obviously the entire Kanara district is not a part of Konkan. The name of the Gazetteer is thus no indication of the linguistic character of each and every part of the district. Moreover, the extracts from the same gazetteer quoted earlier will show that the Belgaum taluka is predominantly a Marathi tract.

6.53. The population of the nine villages east of Belgaum, viz. Nilgi, Kalakhamb, Mutage, Sambre, Basarikiatti, Khangaon Kh., Chandgad, Ashte and Muchandi claimed by this Government consists of 9,616 Marathi-speaking people and 4,054 Kannad-speaking people. The Village Panchayats of Kannad villages Kudchi and Kanabargi which geographically intervene between the nine Marathi villages mentioned above and the Belgaum city have passed resolutions requesting for their merger with the Maharashtra State. As a result the geographical contiguity of these nine villages, with the Belgaum city stands established. The effect will be that a large number of people will be spared the inconvenience of being a linguistic minority. This claim based on the wishes of the people and in keeping with the principle of reducing the linguistic minorities to the minimum ought to be upheld (Appendix I, Map No. 4).

Khanapur Taluka

6.54. The Khanapur taluka consists of 257 villages including the towns of Khanapur and Nandgad. The total area of this taluka is 675.2 sq. miles and the total population is 99,790. Out of this 206 villages, including both the towns of Khanapur and Nandgad with an area of 587.1 sq. miles and a population of 68,522 comprising 77 per cent Marathi-speaking people, 12 per cent Kannad-speaking people and 11 per cent others, are claimed by the Government of Maharashtra. Appendix IV shows the language composition of each village and town. It will be seen that in each of the 206 villages and towns claimed the Marathi-speaking people form the largest single language group villagewise except those Kannad-speaking villages which form enclaves. This area is contiguous to the districts of Ratnagiri and Kolhapur, in the State of Maharashtra. The repeated expression of the will of the people of the disputed border areas is in favour of their transfer to Maharashtra State. In all the elections that have been held after 1956 candidates favouring transfer to Maharashtra have been returned with a thumping majority routing those who were in favour of continuance in Mysore State. The following figures give the picture in detail:

Taluka Development Board Elections 1960

Name of Taluka	No. of seats	No. of seats contested by M.E.S.	No. of Samiti Candidates elected
Khanapur	15	13	9

Mysore Legislative Assembly Elections, Khanapur Constituency.

Year	No. of votes polled by M. E. S. Candidate	No. of votes polled by the Congress Candidate	Excess of Samiti candidate's votes over Congress Candidate's votes
1957 ..	26,401	12,822	13,579
1962 ..	25,107	14,614	10,493
1967 ..	21,281	14,490	6,791

Apart from this the Village Panchayats of the most of these villages as also the Taluka Development Board have time and again passed resolutions expressing their desire that the villages should be transferred to Maharashtra. The people of this area have also given vent to their feelings for transfer to Maharashtra through meetings, processions, demonstrations, etc. It will thus be seen that this area satisfies all the four principles enunciated by the Government of Maharashtra in paragraph 3.3 earlier.

6.55. Since immemorable times, MARATHI has been the language of this taluka. Prior to the British advent, old records and 'SANADS' (Title Deeds), granted by the then rulers are all in Marathi, written in both Devanagari and Modi scripts. Records of Local bodies and Government Revenue Offices are maintained in Marathi. Some of the Marathi magazines "LOKAMITRA" and "SARASWAT DNYATI BANDHAVA" were started in Khanapur as long back as 1890. The circulation of Marathi dailies, weeklies and bi-weeklies in Khanapur taluka is nearly four to five times that of similar Kannad publications. A Marathi dramatic company was organised by a resident of Khanapur, viz., late Shri Dattopant Haliyalkar before 1896. The social and religious festivals observed by the people in this taluka are those observed in Maharashtra and not those by the Kannadigas. The signboards and posters in the Khanapur

taluka and particularly in the area claimed are also in Marathi. The conduct of trade and maintenance of accounts are also no exceptions to the use of Marathi.

The existing oldest Marathi primary schools at Khanapur and Nandgad were established more than 100 years ago. Out of 22,866 primary school students, 14,213 are Marathi-speaking which constitute more than 60 per cent and out of the rest 7,199 are Kannada-speaking. There are 1,635 secondary school students, out of whom 1,132 are Marathi-speaking constituting 69 per cent, 263 are Kannada-speaking constituting 16 per cent. and 240 with English medium forming 15 per cent.

It will thus be seen that historical, social and cultural ties of the Khanapur taluka are with Maharashtra.

6.56. The representatives of Mysore Government have urged that there is no geographical contiguity in respect of the four southern villages Godgeri, Godoli, Pur and Tavargatti with the Marathi-speaking villages of the taluka as they are separated by uninhabited and non-Marathi villages and therefore, they should remain in the Mysore State. This contention is not correct as the habited villages, viz., Bhistenhatti, Gumdoli, Balgund and Nagar-galli, have relative majority of Marathi-speaking people and the rest are uninhabited villages. Since the uninhabited villages intervene between two Marathi-speaking areas they should be merged with the Marathi tract. Apart from this, these four southern villages are contiguous to the Marathi-speaking tract of Haliyal taluka.

6.57. The representatives of the Mysore Government have also argued for the retention of these areas in the Mysore State on the grounds that the upper Malaprabha irrigation project is expected to irrigate more areas in the Kannad region than in the Marathi region and its head-works are in these areas. It is not possible to comment on the merits of this contention in the absence of details. Apart from this, similar pleas made against the demarcation of boundary on linguistic basis have been negated by the Punjab Boundary Commission. Besides, retention of Bellary in Mysore in spite of the Tungabhadra project argues in favour of including these areas in Maharashtra.

CHIKODI AND HUKERI TALUKAS—NIPANI BHAG

Composition and Topography

6.58. Nipani town and the surrounding area which is commonly known as Nipani Bhag is proposed by this Government for inclusion in Maharashtra. This Nipani Bhag comprises the town of Nipani, 42 Marathi-majority villages in the Chikodi taluka and 9 Marathi-majority villages in Hukeri taluka. It has an area of about 175 square miles. The Marathi-speaking population is about 1,16,000 and the Kannada-speaking population about 21,000. It is surrounded on the South by the Gadhinglaj taluka of the Kolhapur district, on the West by the Kagal taluka of the Kolhapur district, on the North by the Kagal and Hatkanangale talukas of the Kolhapur district and on the East by the Chikodi and the Hukeri talukas of the Belgaum district. It extends along the eastern slope of the Sahyadri and lies above the Phonda Ghat which joins this Bhag with the Konkan. Through this Bhag runs the Poona-Bangalore National Highway which joins this area to Kolhapur and other parts of Maharashtra State in the North and to Belgaum and northern parts of Mysore State in the South.

6.59. Nipani is the second biggest town in the Belgaum district with 66·6 per cent Marathi-speaking population and 15·5 per cent Kannada-speaking population according to the Census of 1951. It is situated on the National Highway about 25 miles south of Kolhapur and about 45 miles north of Belgaum. It is in the centre of a fertile tract and is a big market place. It stands at the entrance of the route through the Phonda Ghat to the Konkan and is, therefore, a centre of trade for the Konkan. It has been a famous market of tobacco which is exported to different parts of India and also to Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon and Aden. Besides tobacco, the other commodities in the market of Nipani are jowar, chillies, groundnut, jaggery and betel leaves. The boundary of Maharashtra is only one mile away from the town of Nipani. Being surrounded by the former Kolhapur State, it has always been an important centre of Maharashtrian culture. The Jawaharlal Nehru Water Works which is the source of water supply to Nipani town stands partly in Maharashtra State and partly in Mysore State.

Historical Background

6.60. This area belonged to a Maratha Chief called Desai. When he died issueless in 1839, his territory was annexed by the British who included it in the Chikodi Sub-Division of the then Belgaum Collectorate. The fact that administrative units under the British Administration were formed purely as a result of accident and administrative convenience of the moment and are no indication of any organic unity is heavily under-scored by the case of Nipani. The Nipani town and the Nipani Bhag are quite clearly a part of the Marathi region and but for the accident that Kolhapur was a Princely State which surrounded this area on three sides, namely, south, west and north, there is no doubt whatever that this tract would have been joined to the adjoining talukas of Kagal and Gadhinglaj. As it was, however, there was no option for the British but to join it to the portion of the Belgaum district on the east which alone had contiguity with it. That is how this predominantly Marathi-speaking area came to be a part of the Chikodi taluka which is predominantly a Kannada-speaking area.

6.61. After Independence, a proposal to constitute the Nipani Bhag into a separate taluka was under consideration. Due to the linguistic reorganisation of the various provinces which was in the offing, this proposal was not pursued. If this area had been formed into a taluka, it would certainly have been included by the States Reorganisation Commission in the Bombay State as the percentage of Marathi-speaking population in the Nipani Bhag is about 73. The accidental inclusion of the Nipani Bhag in the Chikodi taluka has thus resulted in its retention in the same taluka of Mysore State.

Linguistic Homogeneity

6.62. As mentioned above, the percentage of Marathi-speaking people in Nipani town is about 67 and that in the whole of the Nipani Bhag about 73. The Kannada-speaking population of the Nipani town is about 15 per cent and that in the Nipani Bhag about 17 per cent. Due to this, most of the Kannada-speaking people in this Bhag are bilingual and use Marathi in all spheres of social and business activities. Not only the people of the Nipani Bhag use Marathi in every day life but the village records have also been

maintained in Marathi. The records, minutes and proceedings of the Nipani Municipal Borough have been in Marathi since its inception in 1854. Almost all shops and institutions and business concerns also use Marathi to maintain their accounts and in their every day transactions. Sign-boards of shops and firms are mostly in Marathi.

Education

6.63. According to the information available to this Government, in Nipani proper there are 12 Marathi Primary Schools with 3,726 students and 112 teachers whereas there are 3 Kannada Primary Schools with 364 students and 12 teachers. There are 4 High Schools with only one High School having a Kannada shift. There are 2,057 students with Marathi medium and 182 students with Kannada medium. In the Nipani Bhag, exclusive of Nipani town, there are about 50 Marathi Primary Schools with about 8,500 students and about 300 teachers and about 12 Kannada Primary Schools with about 1,100 students and about 25 teachers. There are also four High Schools with Marathi medium but no High School with Kannada medium. Some of the Kannada Primary Schools in the villages of the Nipani Bhag have been started recently. In all the Secondary Schools of the Nipani Bhag the medium of instruction is Marathi. They were started by educational institutions of Maharashtra such as (1) Latthe Education Society of Sangli ; (2) Rayat Shikshan Sanstha of Satara ; (3) Vidyapeeth Education Society of Kolhapur ; (4) Benadikar Education Society of Kolhapur, etc. The records of the Nipani Municipality will show that the attempts to start Kannada Primary Schools had to be given up for want of students.

6.64. 19 Centres of Hindi Examination in Nipani Bhag are affiliated to the Maharashtra Rashtrabhasha Prachar Sabha, Poona, because the medium of instruction of the students is Marathi.

Common Characteristics

6.65. The Nipani Bhag has close affinity with Maharashtra. Owing to the linguistic and historical connections of centuries Maharashtrian way of life in all fields finds an echo in the Nipani Bhag. The movements of social reform in Maharashtra carried on by leaders like Annasaheb Shinde and Mahatma Jyotiba Phule

had their effect in this area also, because the people here are culturally one with the people of Maharashtra. These leaders had no following in Karnatak.

6.66. This area has also produced some front-rank Marathi writers. They are the late Prof. K. P. Kulkarni, author of Vyutpatti Kosh; Shri K. R. Dixit, playwright; Smt. Kamal Phadake, short story writer and Smt. Indira Sant, poetess.

6.67. If we turn to entertainment, we find that Marathi films are always shown in the theatres of Nipani and Marathi plays are staged there. On the other hand, Kannada films or plays are to be seen rarely.

6.68. Marathi newspapers and periodicals have a great demand in this area. Although the latest figures are not available to this Government, Marathi dailies such as Lok Satta, Sakal, Prabhat, Maratha, Maharashtra Times, Navshakti, Navyug, Kesari, etc. are sold in this area to the extent of over 2,000 copies a day whereas the sale of Kannada periodicals does not exceed 200.

6.69. The Nipani Town Municipal Library has about 5,800 books, of which about 5,300 are in Marathi, about 110 are in Kannada and the rest are in other languages. Of the 82 periodicals subscribed to by the library, 52 are Marathi, 12 Kannada and 20 others.

Social Structure

6.70. The social structure of Nipani Bhag is an exact counterpart of the social structure in Maharashtra. In this Bhag one comes across Brahmins, Marathas and Harijans as chief communities and Muslims, Jains and Lingayats in smaller numbers. This is the social spectrum of Maharashtra also. Family names such as Kadam, Gaikwad, Jadhav, Chavan, Deshmukh, etc., which are common in Maharashtra are found all over the Nipani Bhag. They use Marathi in all walks of life. Only a few families of Jains and Lingayats speak Kannada at home but in their case also the language of social intercourse is Marathi. The social customs, religious beliefs, rites and ceremonies, and festival are the same as those in Maharashtra. The family deities and holy places to which the people of the Nipani Bhag are devoted are those of Maharashtra. They are devotees of Mahalakshmi of

Kolhapur, Jyotiba of Kolhapur, Bhavani of Tuljapur, Vithoba of Pandharpur, Datta of Narsinhawadi and Khandoba of Jejuri. In Karnatak, temples of Goddess Laxmi are rarely seen but they are found in Nipani and the surrounding places such as Mamdapur, Lakhanapur, Lat, etc. Even Muslims in this area are Marathi-speaking people though they learn Urdu in Primary Schools as in Maharashtra. Christians who are few in number are also Marathi-speaking.

6.71. The Jain community in this area is closely associated with the Dakshin Maharashtra Jain Sabha, largest and most influential organisation of the Jain community in southern Maharashtra with its headquarters at Sangli. Although the Jain families speak Kannada at home, they maintain their accounts in Marathi and send their children to Marathi schools.

Economic Affiliations

6.72. The States Reorganisation Commission have remarked in paragraph 348 on page 98 of their report as follows:—

“All the talukas of Belgaum district have economic relations with both the Marathi as well as the Kannada speaking areas. The Belgaum town is the centre of the transit trade in this area, which is chiefly in cotton and oil-seeds. Neither the Belgaum town nor the other disputed areas, however, have any particularly marked economic affiliations with the Marathi-speaking districts of Bombay.”

While dealing with the case of Belgaum town, it has been shown how the Commission were misinformed regarding the trade of Belgaum town. Their information in respect of the trade of Nipani town is no less inaccurate. Nipani has particularly marked economic affiliations with the Marathi-speaking districts of former Bombay State as compared with the Kannada-speaking districts of Mysore.

6.73. As already pointed out in paragraph 6.59, Nipani town is situated on the Poona-Bangalore road. The villages lying within a radius of about 15 miles from Nipani serve as the hinterland for the market of Nipani. A large majority of these villages is Marathi-speaking. By far the most important commodity in the

Nipani market is tobacco and the information supplied by the Collectors of Central Excise at Poona and Bangalore shows that during the year 1963-64 the quantity of tobacco sent to the market of Nipani from villages in Maharashtra and the Marathi-majority areas in the Mysore State was much more than the quantity received from the Kannada majority villages in the Mysore State. This is also confirmed by the figures of tobacco trade supplied by the Nipani Municipality which are given in Appendix VI(2). So far as the export of tobacco is concerned, besides the markets in northern India such as Jabalpur, Gondia, Sagar, Calcutta, etc., to which tobacco is exported from Nipani, considerable quantities are also exported to markets in Maharashtra such as Nagpur, Kamptee, Nasik, Sholapur, Poona, Ahmednagar, Sangli, Kolhapur, Bombay for 'Bidi' production as well as local consumption. Some quantity is also exported to places in southern India such as Madras, Tirunelveli, Tirucherpalli, Coimbatore, Calicut, Trivendrum, etc., but the quantity of tobacco exported to Kannada region is very small. So far as tobacco is concerned, therefore, the volume of trade with Marathi areas is much more than with the Kannada region of Mysore State.

6.74. Standing at the entrance of the route through Phonda Ghat to the South Konkan, Nipani has become an important trading centre for various commodities for the southern part of Ratnagiri district and up-country regions of South Maharashtra. Tobacco, jaggery and chillies are exported largely to Malvan, Vengurla, Ajra, Kankavali and Ratnagiri, by truck and bullock cart. Besides, betel leaves is another important item of this trade. The Konkan area from Ratnagiri to Vengurla consumes betel leaves to the extent of about 8 lakhs of rupees a year. In exchange of these commodities, the Nipani market imports from the Konkan considerable quantities of coconut, mangoes, tamarind, timber sheets, timber, etc. Groundnut, jaggery and chillies are exported in considerable quantities to North Konkan and other districts in Maharashtra and Gujarat. Comparatively small quantities of these commodities go to Bijapur and some parts of Belgaum district. Betel leaves are also exported to the Pan Markets of Bombay City and to the markets of Kolhapur, Sangli, Poona, etc., the trade amounting to about Rs. 16 lakhs a year.

6.75. The agricultural produce including tobacco of the Kannada-speaking area of Chikodi taluka is sent to the markets of Sadalga, Jaisingpur and Sangli while jaggery is sent to Gadhinglaj, Gokak and Bijapur. Only about 20 per cent of this produce goes to the market of Nipani. In the Chikodi and Hukeri talukas there are market places like Sadalga, Gokak, Pachchapur, Sankeshwar for the Kannad-speaking area but, for the Marathi-speaking areas of western Chikodi taluka and the adjoining areas of Kolhapur district, Nipani is the only place to which the cultivators of these areas turn for marketing their produce.

6.76. The big and small industries that have come up at Kolhapur, Ichalkaranji and Sangli in Maharashtra have provided livelihood to many a young man of Nipani Bhag. The educated youth from this area seeks employment in Maharashtra. The people have hardly any connection with Mysore State except for Court work and work with Government offices.

6.77. The above facts make it amply clear that the economic affiliations of Nipani Bhag are principally with the Konkan, the adjoining districts of Maharashtra and Bombay City and not to any comparable extent with the Kannada districts in the south.

Administrative Aspect

6.78. The Chikodi taluka consists of 10 towns and 92 villages with a population of 2,69,641, according to 1951 Census. 49·3 per cent of this population is Kannada-speaking and 42·1 per cent Marathi-speaking. The Marathi-speaking population is not evenly interspersed throughout the taluka but is mainly concentrated in the western part of the taluka where the proportion of Marathi to Kannada-speaking population is 73 : 17. Besides, Chikodi is a very big taluka, its population being almost twice the population of a normal taluka. Because of this, it has been divided into two sectors for administrative purposes, namely, Nipani Bhag and Chikodi Bhag. The Nipani Bhag has thus already been functioning as an administrative unit with Nipani as its headquarters in the following departments of administration:—

- (i) *Police*.—Police Station with Sub-Inspector for town and village areas;

- (ii) Revenue—Circle Office with a Circle Officer;
- (iii) Registration—Office of Sub-Registrar;
- (iv) Survey —City Survey Office;
- (v) Education—Taluka Centre with a Taluka Master;
- (vi) Agriculture—Agricultural Development Office;
- (vii) Finance—Sub-Treasury Office.

The Education Department as well as the District School Board of Belgaum are also understood to have divided Chikodi taluka into two sectors, namely, Nipani and Chikodi for administrative and supervision work.

6.79. As the Chikodi taluka has thus virtually been divided into two administrative units, a demarcation of it on linguistic basis would be more convenient from all angles and would not disturb or dislocate administrative or economic set up; on the contrary, it would help to remove many hardships and difficulties.

People's Hardships

6.80. Due to the fact that the official language of the Mysore State in which this Nipani Bhag is placed is Kannada, the people have to put up with a number of hardships. There have been complaints that Marathi-speaking persons are generally denied Government employment on the plea that they do not know Kannada. Marathi students are naturally not able to compete with the Kannada students through Kannada medium. The people feel that deliberate attempts are made to impose Kannada language on them even in minor matters such as street names, sign posts, sign boards, mile stones, prescribed application forms, notices etc. In the Nipani Bhag the litigation, both criminal and civil, involves consideration of evidence in Marathi language and script. However, most of the Judges, Magistrates and other staff do not often know even a word of Marathi. Similar is the case in Sales-Tax, Income Tax and other offices. Marathi is also not a recognised language in the Mysore Circle of the Posts and Telegraphs Department. Students have to learn five languages including Kannada. What is worse, they have to learn them at the tender age of 7 or 8. Even in Marathi schools the orders of the Mysore Government are received in Kannada language which is not understood by Marathi teachers. Being at the far end of the State which is ruled by

a different linguistic group, the people feel that they have no voice in the social and economic development of their region. The development of this region is said to be at a standstill. This has created a minority complex among the Marathi-speaking population retarding their progress. It has also created frustration among the Marathi-speaking students because they find that in the Kannada-speaking State their prospects are bleak. A similar situation exists in the other disputed border areas in the Mysore State (Appendix V).

Wishes of the People

6.81. Because of these hardships the people have been agitating for inclusion of their area in Maharashtra. They have by all legitimate means expressed their ardent desire to be included in Maharashtra where they expect to find congenial atmosphere for their progress. They resorted to 'hartals' and 'satyagrahas'. Even a "No-Tax Campaign" was organised in desperation. Representations were made to the Zonal Council, the Four-Man Committee and the Government of India, but without success. The feelings of the people were expressed in the General Elections of 1957 when about 76 per cent of the votes were cast in favour of the candidate of the Maharashtra Ekikaran Samiti, who stood for immediate transfer of this area to Maharashtra. In the General Elections of 1962 and 1967 the pro-merger vote was about 72 and 60 per cent despite the changed delimitations of the constituency. The election results were as follows :—

	Total votes	Votes polled	Maharashtra Ekikaran Samiti	Congress	Ind.	Excess of Samiti Candidate's votes over Congress Candidate's Votes
1957 ..	43,361	34,321	26,068	7,733	422	18,335
1962 ..	51,883	38,005	27,280	9,274	..	18,006
1967 ..	58,250	49,019	29,041	17,575	474	11,466

In the Taluka Development Board Elections of 1960, 5 candidates supported by the Ekikaran Samiti were elected. The Nipani Municipality and most of the grampanchayats in this Bhag have passed resolutions for transfer of this area to Maharashtra.

Mysore's Contentions

6.82. The claim of Maharashtra in respect of Nipani Bhag is resisted by the Government of Mysore on the grounds set out in paragraphs 43-46 of their "Views" on the Border Dispute. They are as follows:

(i) The linguistic figures of the 1951 Census showing that Nipani had a Marathi-speaking population of 16,202 out of the total population of 24,325 cannot be taken as authentic on account of the disputes in the area and the distortions made by the enumerators as remarked by the Census Superintendent.

(ii) If a resorting of Census slips is made, it would show that only 12,390 out of 16,202 Marathi-speaking population of Nipani was born in the district. Trade and opportunities for employment in Nipani have clearly attracted a large number of Marathi-speaking persons and it is evident that the locally born Marathi-speaking population of Nipani is only 50.9 per cent as against the percentage of 39.9 in the Chikodi taluka.

(iii) The jurisdiction of the Agricultural Produce Market Committee constituted for Nipani in 1955 extends over all the villages in Chikodi taluka and jaggery, groundnut and chillies have been declared as the agricultural produce for the purpose of regulating sale and purchase of commodities. Some 21 villages lying within the radius of five miles from Nipani were included within the definition of the "Market Proper". These facts show that goods taken to the market of Nipani are mostly from Kannada villages.

(iv) Nipani town is an important market for tobacco and most of the leading merchants in the town are Lingayats and Jains who speak Kannada at home.

(v) The tobacco which comes to the market at Nipani is mostly from the Kannada-speaking villages of Chikodi taluka. Therefore, any separation of Nipani from these villages would adversely affect the economic interests of that region.

(vi) The existence of some Marathi-speaking villages to the north of Nipani near the border line cannot be a good ground for separating Nipani which is so closely connected with the predominantly Kannada-speaking villages of the taluka.

(vii) The fact that the people of Nipani have been agitating since many years past for a railway link with Raibag, Bagalkot and Raichur and not with Kolhapur shows how inextricably their economic and commercial interests are connected with Karnatak and not with Maharashtra.

(viii) Nipani is the only important market area for jaggery and tobacco in Karnatak and has, therefore, assumed commercial importance in Chikodi taluka. For the Marathi villages on the border of Mysore State and in Maharashtra, there are centres for trade in these commodities at Kolhapur, Sangli and Jaisingpur. If Nipani is separated from Chikodi taluka, it will lose all its commercial importance as another centre—probably Chikodi or some other town—will have to be found for the establishment of a market area for the two commodities. Nipani has developed as an organic part of the taluka and it would affect the entire economy not only of the town but of the adjoining Kannada-speaking areas if it is included in Maharashtra State.

(ix) Groundnut, chillies and betel leaves are mainly imported into Nipani from the Kannada-speaking area of Chikodi and adjoining talukas. Jowar, onions, etc. come from Bijapur and other Kannada areas to Nipani for onward export to Ratnagiri and Kolhapur. Although these commodities may be exported to districts in Maharashtra, they come into Nipani market from Kannada areas in the Mysore State.

(x) What has been said about the social structure of other areas of Belgaum district applies with equal force to Nipani. The Mahadeva and Venkataramana temples in Nipani are Kannada temples. The indigenous population is Kannada and much of the Marathi influence is due to the proximity of Kolhapur and particularly because of the fact that Nipani was ruled by Marathas till it was annexed by the British.

Replies to Mysore's Contentions

6.83. (i) In questioning the authenticity of the linguistic figures of the 1951 Census in respect of Nipani, the Mysore Government's

reliance on the Census Superintendent is of dubious value. This is what the latter has stated :

“ It was also alleged that Kannada was suffering in Nipani and Sholapur by reason of the partiality of enumerators. I visited Nipani while the Census was going on. I found no evidence of wrong recording of mother-tongue nor was the atmosphere in linguistic circles there strained as it undoubtedly was in Belgaum city.”

“ There was some minor linguistic trouble over Konkani in Karwar district, but this attained no dimensions. I did find wilful distortion in the replies to question 8 (bilingualism) in Belgaum Municipal area. Here even educated persons who were protagonists of Kannada or Marathi professed not to use any language other than their mother-tongue presumably from fear that acknowledgement of the fact would strengthen the position of the other language. The bilingualism figures in such areas are probably not excessively accurate, *but particulars about mother-tongue are, I believe, quite reliable everywhere.*”

Thus the Census Superintendent has stated in unequivocal terms that he found no evidence of wrong recording of mother-tongue and that particulars about mother-tongue were quite reliable every where.

(ii) The Mysore Government's estimate of the percentage of the locally born Marathi-speaking population of Nipani (viz. 50·9) is based apparently on a resorting of Census slips made by that Government as, it is understood, the figures of the locally born population with reference to the Census of 1951 were not worked out by the Census Organisation. The percentage is not, therefore, authentic. Even so, it may be noted that it is almost 51. It is interesting to note that while the Mysore Government has taken pains to work out the percentage of the locally born Marathi-speaking population of Nipani, it has not done so in respect of the locally born Kannada population. At least it has not stated what that percentage is. The linguistic composition of Nipani according to the 1951 Census was 66·6 per cent Marathi and 15·5 per cent Kannada. The locally born Kannada population must, therefore, be less than 15 per cent. Mysore's contention that

a large number of Nipani's Marathi-speaking population consists of outsiders is, therefore, not borne out by any authentic and factual data.

(iii) The Mysore Government have stated that the jurisdiction of the Agricultural Produce Market Committee of Nipani covers all the villages in the Chikodi taluka; that jaggery, groundnut and chillies have been declared as the agricultural produce for the market; that 21 villages within a radius of five miles from Nipani were included in the definition of "Market Proper" and that these facts show that the goods taken to the market of Nipani are mostly from Kannada villages. The question whether the goods coming to the Nipani market are largely from the Marathi-speaking area or the Kannada-speaking area must be determined by a detailed scrutiny of the transactions at the market and from the records of the concerned offices. In view of the disparate claims put forward by the two State Governments in regard to the trade of Nipani, the Government of India had desired that the disparities should be reconciled. For this purpose, the Government of Maharashtra had proposed to depute one of its officers to Nipani for checking up the figures put forward by the two Governments in regard to the trade of Nipani with reference to the records of the Agricultural Produce Market Committee, the Nipani Municipality and other Government offices, if necessary. The Government of Mysore, however, did not agree to this. The Government of Maharashtra, therefore, has reason to believe that the contention of the Government of Mysore is wrong. The position regarding the trade of Nipani according to the information available to this Government has been explained in paragraphs 6.72 to 6.77 above. According to the Collectors of Central Excise at Poona and Bangalore, during the year 1963-64, about 4,340 tonnes of tobacco went to Nipani for first warehousing on TP-2 and TP-3 forms from villages in Maharashtra and the Marathi majority villages in the Mysore State whereas the quantity sent from the Kannada area in the Mysore State was about 3,430 tonnes. Comparatively, therefore, the Marathi area had a larger tobacco trade at Nipani, than the Kannada area. As regards the other commodities, this Government is unable to comment for want of authentic figures.

(iv) While stating that most of the leading merchants in Nipani are Lingayats and Jains who speak Kannada at home, the Mysore Government have overlooked the fact that these merchants use Marathi for all their business activities and social intercourse and that a number of them desire that Nipani should be transferred to Maharashtra.

(v) The Mysore Government's contention that the tobacco which comes to the market of Nipani is mostly from the Kannada-speaking villages of Chikodi taluka, has been found on verification to be not true.

(vi) The existence of some Marathi-speaking villages to the north of Nipani is not the ground urged by the Government of Maharashtra for inclusion of Nipani in Maharashtra. It is because Nipani has an overwhelming majority of Marathi-speaking population and because it is situated in a tract of Marathi majority villages, which tract is contiguous to Maharashtra, that Nipani and the whole tract are proposed to be included in Maharashtra. Nipani is connected not only with the Kannada majority villages of Chikodi taluka but also with predominantly Marathi-speaking villages in that taluka as also with important places in Maharashtra.

(vii) The demand of the people of Nipani for a railway link with Raibag has been misinterpreted. True, they want a rail link with Raibag, but not because they want facilities of communication with Kannad areas. It is because they want easy access to north-eastern markets such as Calcutta and south-eastern markets such as Madras. Nipani-Kolhapur-Miraj link would have served the purpose for north-eastern markets but would have left the problem of access to south-eastern markets unsolved. By Nipani-Raibag link, access to both north-eastern and south-eastern markets will be secured. Besides, about 40 Marathi-majority villages out of about 50 in Nipani Bhag lie within a radius of ten miles from the proposed Nipani-Raibag line and their development would be helped as much by Nipani Raibag railway as by Nipani-Kolhapur railway. For these reasons, the demand was for a rail link with Raibag and not

with Kolhapur which itself is easily accessible by road. The inference that the demand for a railway link with Raibag shows that economic and commercial interests of the people of Nipani are inextricably connected with Raibag and other places in Karnatak is, to say the least, misleading.

(viii) It is not correct that Nipani is the only market place for Kannada area of Chikodi taluka for jaggery and tobacco. As has already been pointed out, the agricultural produce including tobacco from the Kannada part of Chikodi taluka is sent to the markets of Sadalga, Jaisingpur and Sangli while jaggery is sent to Jamkhandi, Gokak and Bijapur. Only about 20 per cent of this produce goes to the market of Nipani. In Chikodi and Hukeri talukas, there are other market places like Sadalga, Gokak, Pachhapur and Sankeshwar in the Kannada-speaking area. The Mysore Government's apprehension that if Nipani is separated from Chikodi taluka, it would lose all its commercial importance as some other centres would be found for marketing jaggery, tobacco, etc., is misconceived. If it were so, the business community of Nipani would not have favoured inclusion of Nipani in Maharashtra. Besides, whether any other market would come into being as a result of Nipani's transfer to Maharashtra would depend on the hardship that may be caused to the merchant community thereby. The Government of Maharashtra do not anticipate any such hardship. Similar misgivings were voiced before the Linguistic Provinces Commission in regard to Bombay City. It was feared by some experts that the commercial and financial interests of Bombay City and of India as a whole would be affected by a sudden change in the form of Government in Bombay, i.e. by Bombay becoming the capital of a unilingual province. Events have, however, proved the experts wrong. There is no reason to suppose that in the case of Nipani they would be right.

(ix) As regards the marketing of groundnut, chillies, betel-leaves, oil, onions, etc. from the Kannada-majority areas of Chikodi and adjoining talukas, at the market of Nipani, the Government of Maharashtra is unable to make any comments for the reason mentioned in sub-paragraph (iii) above, namely, that

the Government of Mysore did not afford the necessary facilities for investigating its claim in this respect.

(x) The social structure of Nipani Bhag which has an overwhelming majority of Marathi-speaking population cannot but be the same as in Maharashtra. This has been dealt with in paragraphs 6·70 and 6·71 above.

Mysore Representatives' arguments

6.84. Shri Malimath and Shri Channah, Mysore's representatives on the Four-Man Committee, have repeated some of the foregoing arguments for retention of Nipani in the Mysore State, and added a few of their own, in paragraphs 268 to 285 of their report. Their new arguments are summarised below :—

(i) Prior to its acquisition by the British, Nipani was the headquarters of a local Chief called Desai, whose official language was Marathi. On his death in 1839, his territories were divided by the British among different districts, the main portion going to Belgaum. All this area was Kannada-speaking but it must be on account of the influence of the Marathi Chief that later on the proportion of Marathi population increased. In spite of it, Kannada language still persists in the immediate neighbourhood of Nipani. This indicates that Marathi must have been a super-imposition owing to the influence of the Marathi Chief.

(ii) The Government of Maharashtra does not rely upon or mention anything about the trade relations of Nipani either in the initial memorandum or in the reply statement submitted by their Chief Minister after averments were made by the Mysore Government regarding the trade of Nipani being mostly with Kannada villages. The normal inference is that it has nothing to challenge the case made out by the Government of Mysore on this point.

(iii) On the basis of TP-2 and TP-3 forms maintained by the Central Excise Department, arrivals of tobacco into Nipani market from the Kannada areas in 1954-55 was 2,25,150 B. Maunds and from Marathi areas 1,09,329 B. Maunds i.e. arrivals from Kannada areas were 69 per cent while those from Marathi area were 31 per cent.

(iv) The receipts at Octroi Nakas show that Nipani has a bigger quantity of goods coming from Kannada areas as compared with the Marathi areas.

(v) The figure of acreage of each produce under cultivation in all 38 villages and 3 towns (including the town of Nipani) which are claimed by Maharashtra, compared with the acreage figures of each produce grown in the remaining villages of Chikodi taluka show that 80 per cent of the produce coming into the Nipani market is grown in the Kannada area of Chikodi taluka.

(vi) To facilitate private transactions of Marathi-speaking people, an office of the Sub-Registrar has been located at Nipani where registration is allowed to be done of documents written either in Kannada or Marathi. This may be contrasted with the position that was prevalent in the Kannada areas held by the Chiefs of Princely States where writing in Marathi was enforced and documents written in Kannada were not permitted to be registered. The Marathi-speaking population of this area have no difficulty of this sort.

(vii) There are several Marathi schools in Nipani and other villages where primary education is given in Marathi. Although provision has been made for teaching of Kannada, it is optional. So far as the secondary education is concerned, there are three High Schools of which two are run by Kannada-people and one by Marathi people. Provision is made for teaching in Marathi and also in Kannada as needed.

(viii) The K. L. E. Society of Belgaum recently established an Arts and Science College at Nipani. Almost simultaneously, the Marathi-speaking people of Nipani, assisted by those of Maharashtra, started an Arts College for Nipani just outside its limits in Maharashtra State at Arjun Nagar. There is no High School nearby in Maharashtra which can feed this College. It has been alleged that the idea behind starting the College is to stifle the efforts of the K. L. E. Society in starting their college at Nipani and also to pave the way for getting Nipani and nearby villages transferred to Maharashtra. The Government of Maharashtra donated Rs. 5 lakhs for this College. This

is an attempt to wean away the students from another State or to show to the people of that State that the Maharashtra Government are more interested in their welfare. This is not a step that can be appreciated. It is calculated to cause disharmony between the States and their people.

(ix) For the purpose of official business the language of Chikodi taluka was declared to be Kannada by a resolution of the Government of Bombay dated 17th May 1950. The fact that such a decision was taken by that Government (in which Maharashtrians had a predominant voice at that time) after taking into consideration all the effects of the merger of Princely States clearly vindicates the stand that this area was accepted to be Kannada by the Government of Bombay. In the whole Belgaum district the only taluka that was declared as bilingual for official business was Shahapur. All other talukas were declared to be Kannada.

Mysore Representatives' arguments examined

6.85. (i) While the Mysore Representatives have conceded that Nipani has preponderance of Marathi, they have attributed it to the influence of the local Maratha Chief, who died in 1839. Be that as it may, if the predominance of Marathi has been there for more than one and a quarter centuries, it is a fact to be reckoned with, and it would not be proper to determine the future of Nipani with reference to the situation which obtained 125 years ago. The position according to the 1951 Census is that Nipani has 66 per cent. Marathi-speaking population as against 15 per cent. Kannada. The logic of this situation is not weakened by the fact that today's position is due to something which happened 125 years ago.

(ii) Nipani being in the Mysore State, it was not possible for the Government of Bombay to obtain authentic information regarding the trade of Nipani. For this reason, no mention of Nipani's trade was made in the initial memorandum of the Government of Bombay. For the same reason, the averments made by the Mysore Government in their "Views" could not be checked and, therefore, nothing could be said about them in the statement submitted by the Chief Minister of Maharashtra to the Four-Man

Committee. The inference drawn from this by Mysore's Representatives that the Government of Maharashtra has nothing to challenge the case made out by the Government of Mysore on this point is, therefore, without substance and merely shows that they were eager to make capital of anything for bolstering up the Mysore Government's case. It has been pointed out already that at the instance of the Government of India, the Maharashtra Government approached the Mysore Government for facilities to check up the contentions of the two Governments regarding the trade of Nipani but that Government was not agreeable to it. This would show that such checking up would have gone against them.

(iii) As regards the tobacco trade of Nipani for the year 1954-55, the Government of Maharashtra were informed by the Collectors of Central Excise at Poona and Bangalore in November 1964 that the required information was not available for want of records. It is not, therefore, possible to say whether the figures given by the Mysore Representatives are correct. It has already been pointed out in sub-paragraph (iii) of paragraph 6.83 above that according to the information supplied by the Collectors of Central excise, the tobacco trade for 1963-64 was more from Marathi majority area than from the Kannada majority area.

(iv) In regard to the points mentioned in sub-paragraphs (iv) and (v) of the preceding paragraphs, the Mysore Representatives' contentions cannot be examined for want of authentic information as explained above.

(v) The Mysore Representatives have pointed out that the Marathi-speaking population of Nipani Bhag has no difficulty regarding registration of documents. The implication is that the people of Nipani are well looked after and have no administrative difficulties. Their difficulties on account of the official language of the State being different from their own, have been explained in paragraph 6.80 above. The grievance of the Mysore Representatives that in the Marathi Princely States no facility was afforded for registration of Kannada documents is altogether irrelevant in the present context.

(vi) In the educational field, the Mysore Representatives have referred to the facilities provided to the Marathi-speaking population in respect of secondary education and made remarks about the role of the Government of Maharashtra in regard to the new college at Arjun Nagar. They have stated that the starting of the college was substantially helped by the Government of Maharashtra by donating a sum of Rs. 5 lakhs and that this was an attempt to wean away the students from another State or to show to the people in the border areas that the Maharashtra Government were more interested in their welfare than the Mysore Government. The Maharashtra Government have made no donation to the Arjun Nagar College. As the Mysore Representatives have dwelt at some length on this matter, it is necessary to mention the facts. There were about 20 secondary Schools in the Nipani area and it was more convenient and less expensive for the students to have a college at Nipani than go to places like Belgaum, Kolhapur or Sangli for college education. On 19th August 1960, the local inhabitants held a meeting at which an Interim Body was formed to start the preliminary work. All people irrespective of caste, language or religion participated in this meeting. It was decided to start the college within the jurisdiction of the Karnatak University, Dharwar. On 21st August 1960, the Chairman of the Interim Body, Shri D. C. Shah, called on the Vice-Chancellor and other Office-bearers of the Karnatak University. He was told that for affiliation with the University, they would have to deposit an amount of Rs. 5 lakhs with the University. As a matter of concession, the University authorities were prepared to accept Rs. 2 lakhs in the beginning and the remaining 3 lakhs in the next three years. It was obviously impossible for an institution founded on public charity to fulfil these conditions. Another attempt to find a solution was made by a deputation consisting of members of the Interim Body which met the Vice-Chancellor on 2nd September 1960, but without success. This deputation was informed that there was no rule in existence regarding a deposit of Rs. 5 lakhs but that the university authorities were "actively thinking" of making such a rule and that it would be applicable to the proposed college at Nipani. Consequently, another meeting of the citizens of Nipani was convened on 4th September 1960 when it was decided to drop

the idea of starting a college at Nipani in the jurisdiction of the Karnatak University. As, however, the need for a college was most pressing, it was decided to establish the college in the jurisdiction of the Poona University at a convenient place near Nipani. According to the conditions of the Poona University, initially, Rs. 25,000 were required to be deposited and Rs. 25,000 each year for the next 3 years, making a total of Rs. 1,00,000 only. A fund of over Rs. 4 lakhs was collected. Some persons donated their lands for the college. Among them was a Kannada-speaking Lingayat without whose donation of 6 acres of land the college would have been cut off from the main road. The foundation stone of the college was laid by H. H. Chhatrapati Shahaji Maharaj of Kolhapur and the inauguration ceremony was performed by the Chief Minister of Maharashtra on 18th June 1961. Till that date, the Government of Maharashtra had no connection whatsoever with the College which was established entirely by popular efforts. It was only on 6th December 1961 that a loan of Rs. 35,000 with interest at 4½ per cent per annum repayable in 15 years was sanctioned by the Maharashtra Government. In these circumstances, it is most unfair for the Mysore Representatives to allege that the Maharashtra Government donated Rs. 5 lakhs for this College with a view to weaning away the population.

(vii) After independence, when the Princely States were merged in the Indian Union whatever administrative decisions regarding official language, apportioning of merged territories among existing talukas, etc., were taken, were of an *ad hoc* nature because linguistic reorganisation of the various provinces had been mooted. Actually, after the notification quoted was issued, representations were received from various people as a result of which, the Bombay Government called for further information from the Collector of Belgaum regarding the percentage of Marathi population and the languages in which the official records were being maintained in the various talukas of Belgaum District. The Collector reported in 1950 that in Chikodi Taluka, the percentage of Marathi-speaking population was 48 and the records in that Taluka were being maintained in English, Marathi and Kannada. Copies of the Collector's letters No. ADM., dated 20th July 1950 and 12th September 1950 are given in Appendix III (4) & (5). However, the

problem had become complex and a revision of the orders already passed was kept pending enactment of the Official Language Bill. It seems that in the atmosphere created by the demands for linguistic provinces, no further action was taken in the matter. It will thus be seen that the notification in question cannot be held to be an argument against Maharashtra's claim to Nipani Bhag.

6.86. As pointed out earlier, if it were not for the fact that this Nipani Bhag, although as big as an ordinary taluka, formed part of Chikodi taluka, probably the States Reorganisation Commission would have recommended its inclusion in Bombay State on the analogy of Chandgad taluka of Belgaum which was detached and included in this State. In view of this and what is stated in the foregoing paragraphs, it seems but fair that this region which also includes 9 contiguous Marathi-majority villages of Hukeri taluka should be merged in Maharashtra.

Hukeri and Athni talukas

6.87. There are 122 villages in the Hukeri taluka with an area of 382.4 square miles. Of these 18 villages with an area of 30.6 square miles having a population of 13,000 comprising 80 per cent Marathi-speaking people, 15 per cent Kannada-speaking people and 5 per cent others, are claimed by the Government of Maharashtra. Nine of these 18 villages form part of the Nipani Bhag and have also been dealt with earlier. They are contiguous to the Kolhapur district in the State of Maharashtra. There are 89 villages in the Athni taluka with an area of 744.4 square miles. Of these 10 villages having an area of 85.7 square miles with population of 20,858 comprising 61 per cent. Marathi-speakers, 33 per cent. Kannada-speakers and 6 per cent. others, are claimed by the Government of Maharashtra. They are contiguous to the Sangli district in the State of Maharashtra. Appendix IV shows the language composition of each village and town in these talukas. It will be seen that in each of the 18 villages in the Hukeri taluka and 10 villages in the Athni taluka, the Marathi-speaking people form the largest single language group. The village panchayats of most of these villages have time and again passed resolutions expressing their desire that the villages should be transferred to

Maharashtra. The people of these areas have also given vent to their feelings for joining Maharashtra through meetings, processions, etc. It will thus be seen that these areas satisfy the principles enunciated by the Government of Maharashtra in paragraph 3.3 earlier. The Government of Mysore or its representatives have not raised any points of significance worthy of comment.

KARWAR-SUPA-HALIYAL TALUKAS OF NORTH KANARA DISTRICT

Maharashtra Government's claim

6.88. Prior to the Reorganisation of the States in 1956, Karwar district was included in the then Bombay State. With the re-organisation of the States, it came to be included in the Mysore State. The Government of Maharashtra's claim is for inclusion of the Marathi-Konkani-speaking areas of the three talukas of Karwar, Supa and Haliyal in the Maharashtra State. The claim is based on the principles of contiguity, village as the unit, relative language majority and wishes of the people. For the purpose of computing relative language majority, the Government of Maharashtra have included the Konkani-speaking people in the Marathi-speaking people for the reasons given in the previous chapter.

Details of areas claimed

6.89. The Karwar taluka consists of the district town of Karwar and two smaller towns of Chitkula and Majali and 58 villages. The Maharashtra Government claim Karwar, Chitkula and Majali and 47 villages, the area of which comes to about 222·4 square miles. The total area of this taluka is 284·2 square miles. The total population of this taluka is 78,591 according to the 1951 census. In this taluka 71·5 per cent. people speak Marathi and 22·6 per cent. speak Kannada. It is thus a taluka with an absolute majority of Marathi-speaking people.

6.90. The taluka of Supa consists of 140 villages, of which 13 are deserted, with an area of 731·9 square miles. Of the 140 villages, the Government of Maharashtra claim 131 villages having an area of about 700·8 square miles. The total population of this taluka is 18,114. In this taluka 82·5 per cent of the people

speak Marathi and 8 per cent speak Kannada. It has thus an absolute majority of Marathi-speaking people.

6.91. The Taluka Haliyal consists of one town—Haliyal and 129 villages with an area of 315·2 square miles. Of these, the Government of Maharashtra claim the town of Haliyal and 119 villages with an area of 285 square miles. The total population of this taluka is 36,514. In this taluka 59·2 per cent of the people speak Marathi and 22·8 per cent speak Kannada. Thus this is a taluka with an absolute majority of Marathi-speaking people.

Relation of Konkani with Marathi

6.92. Relying on the opinions of Dr. S. M. Katre and Mr. S. Silva, the Government of Mysore have expressed the view that Konkani is not a dialect of Marathi but an independent language originated from old Prakrit. While they have conceded that Konkani belongs to Indo-Aryan family to which Marathi among others, belongs, they have observed that Konkani that is spoken in the northern-most region is moulded more or less by Marathi language and that spoken in the two Kanara districts and south-west has been moulded by Kannada, Malayalam, etc. They have also observed that the statements of the Government of Maharashtra that Kannada-speaking population in the Karwar, Haliyal and Supa talukas is only 22·6 per cent, 22·8 per cent. and 8 per cent respectively, while the population speaking Marathi-Konkani is 71·5 per cent, 59·2 per cent and 82·5 per cent respectively and that the best opinion among the linguists is that the Konkani for several centuries has been the language of speech and that Marathi language is generally used in these talukas as its literary counter-part, are inconsistent with the conclusions of research-scholars and implications of the Census figures. They have further observed that three talukas of Karwar, Supa and Haliyal have no linguistic Marathi-majority and these three talukas have been rightly retained in the Mysore State.

6.93. All the points made out by the Government of Mysore in support of their views concerning the relation of Konkani with Marathi, as mentioned above, have already been exhaustively dealt with in Chapter V. A perusal of that chapter will lead

one to conclude that the views of the Government of Mysore being without any sound basis are unacceptable.

6.94. The contention of the Government of Mysore in paragraph 54 of their 'Views on the Border Disputes between the States of Maharashtra and Mysore' that the present arrangement has given Konkani-speaking people an opportunity to develop their own language and script in a manner best suited to their linguistic requirements is wholly unconvincing for, if it were to be so the people in the three Talukas of Karwar, Haliyal and Supa of the North Kanara District would not have passed resolutions expressing their keenness and anxiety to merge with the State of Maharashtra. The contention of the Government of Mysore is certainly without factual basis.

6.95. As regards the Census figures of subsidiary language quoted by the Government of Mysore in paragraph 55 of their 'Views' in support of their view that Konkani-speaking people cannot be counted with the Marathi population for determining the linguistic majority, it is pertinent to point out that the then Superintendent of Census Operations, Bombay State, had said that he found wilful distortion in the replies to the Question 8—Bilingualism in Belgaum Municipal area—and observed that the bilingualism figures of such areas were probably not excessively accurate. For ready reference, the extract from Chapter II of the Administration Report of the Census of India, 1951, Vol. IV, Bombay, Saurashtra and Kutch (pages 10-11) is given below:—

“There was some minor linguistic trouble over Konkani in Karwar district, but this attained no dimensions. I did find wilful distortion in the replies to question 8 (bilingualism) in Belgaum Municipal area. Here even educated persons who were protagonists of Kannada or Marathi professed not to use any language other than their mother-tongue, presumably from fear that acknowledgement of the fact would strengthen the position of the other language. The bilingualism figures in such areas are probably not excessively accurate, but particulars about mother-tongue are, I believe, quite reliable everywhere.”

The Census figures of subsidiary language quoted by the Government of Mysore cannot, therefore, be relied upon. Besides, Mr. Justice L. S. Misra in his report on Bellary Taluq observed that the point about secondary language has no force since it depends upon the education policy of the State or the Municipal Board.

Geographical contiguity

6·96. As indicated in Chapter V geographically, Maharashtra has been intercepted by the Sahyadri range and consists of two parts. The part consisting of the coastal plain between the sea and the Sahyadri has been known as Konkan and the other part above the Ghats is known as Desh. Konkan extends from Damanganga in the north to the Gangavali river in the south. Between the southern part of Ratnagiri and Karwar is the territory of Goa which was acquired by the Portuguese in the beginning of the 16th century. Konkani-Marathi tract of Karwar, Supa and Haliyal talukas in the North Kanara district is hilly and includes the forest belt of Dandeli. This tract is unmistakably part of Konkan. It lies directly south of Khanapur taluka of the Belgaum district and the whole of Marathi-speaking tract of the Belgaum district and the Marathi-Konkani area of the North Kanara district is a compact and a contiguous territory.

6·97. The Government of Mysore contend that North Kanara District (of which Karwar, Supa and Haliyal form three talukas) is not on the border of the Maharashtra State. It forms part of the Mysore State and, therefore, Maharashtra cannot claim its inclusion in any scheme of boundary adjustment. It is pointed out at the outset that the claim of the Government of Maharashtra is not for inclusion of the whole of the North Kanara district but only a small part of it, viz. Konkani-Marathi speaking area of the three talukas of Karwar, Supa and Haliyal. The Government of Mysore have also stated that the North Kanara district is bounded on the north by Goa and Belgaum district, on the east by Dharwar district, etc. It is pertinent to note that the Government of Mysore have conveniently not made a reference here to the Government of Maharashtra's claim for transfer of a part of Belgaum and Khanapur talukas although they had accepted the factual position

that North Kanara district is bounded on the north by Goa and Belgaum district. Even a casual glance at the map of Belgaum and North Kanara districts will clearly show the geographical contiguity of Belgaum district with the present Maharashtra State on the one hand and with the Supa, Haliyal and Karwar talukas of North Kanara district on the other (Appendix I, Map Nos. 1 and 2).

The representatives of the Mysore Government on the Four-man Committee have stated that Karwar taluka does not touch the Maharashtra State and it gets disconnected from Ratnagiri district even if it is assumed that the tract from Ratnagiri to Karwar is one Konkan tract. It needs to be stressed that the question before the Commission is not only in respect of boundary adjustment of certain area in Karwar taluka alone but also in respect of boundary adjustment of certain areas in Belgaum, Khanapur, Supa, Haliyal and Karwar talukas. Maps will indicate how this whole area is compact and contiguous to the State of Maharashtra. (Appendix I, Map Nos. 1 and 2).

The Government of Maharashtra, therefore, contend that the three talukas, are without a shadow of doubt, contiguous to the Maharashtra State and thus form a compact area of Belgaum, Khanapur, Supa, Haliyal and Karwar talukas.

Communications

6.98 As for the communications, there is a highway from Belgaum to Karwar *via* Khanapur and Supa. The same road passes *via* Londa which is an important railway junction only 75 miles from Sadashivgad. There is also a regular steamer service between Karwar and Bombay. Thus, this Marathi tract is well connected by rail, road and sea with Maharashtra.

6.99. The Government of Mysore have stated that the areas which have been transferred from the former Bombay State to the Mysore State under the States Reorganisation Act have been within the jurisdiction of the Karnatak Division for over hundred years. These areas were also included within the jurisdiction of Karnatak Provincial Congress Committee since 1921 with the agreement of all the neighbouring Pradesh Congress Committees including that of Maharashtra.

6.100. The position in regard to these contentions has already been explained in paragraphs 6.10 and 6.11 earlier in this chapter while discussing general points pertaining to this area.

Historical considerations

6.101. The talukas of Karwar, Supa and Haliyal are part of the same West Coast area of Konkan which was intercepted by the territory of Goa acquired by the Portuguese. The inter-position of Goa ruled by the Portuguese between the southern-most part of Konkan and the rest of Konkan was responsible for this Konkani-Marathi tract being included in the Kanara district.

6.102. According to the Government of Mysore, the North Kanara district has always been part of the Karnatak region. This is based on the following quotations from *Kanara Gazetteer* of 1883 :

“ Kanara above Sahyadri belongs to Karnatak.”

“ From very early times it has almost always formed a part of the territories of Great Dynasties which have held Maisur, the Karnatak and the Deccan.”

They have relied on numerous inscriptions and historical descriptions contained in the Imperial Gazetteer and the Gazetteer of Kanara district to state that the North Kanara district was ruled successively by Kadambas of Banavasi, Rattas, the Western Chalukyas and Yadavas.

6.103. As already mentioned above, the Konkani-Marathi tract of Karwar, Supa and Haliyal talukas came to be included in the North Kanara district due to the interception of Goa ruled by the Portuguese. This does not, however, by itself dislodge the fact that it is a part of Konkan. That it is a part of Konkan is clear from the following:—

(1) “ Five miles south-east of the Gangavali river, close to the sandy shore are the temples and sacred pools of Gokarnt according to the Brahman Geographers, the south most point of Konkan” (*vide* page 3 of *Bombay Gazetteer—Kanara Vol. XV, Part I, 1883*).

(2) " The Konkani language is spoken throughout Konkan from Malwan in the north to Karwar in the south." (*Linguistic Survey of India*, Vol. VII by Dr. Grierson).

The views of the Historian and Traveller Mr. Buchanan and Mr. Grant Duff that the southernmost limit of Konkan is at least Gangavali river have already been referred to in Chapter V. Few more authorities to support this view are quoted below:—

(1) The celebrated Marathi Poet of Ankola, Subba Anant Picle, who flourished near about 1766, in his Marathi translation of *Mahabharat* while giving details about his native place says that Ankola is within the province of Gokarn which is the part of Gomantak i.e. Southern Konkan.

(2) The Kadambas who ruled over a large portion of Konkan including northern part of the Kanara district have boastfully described themselves in many copperplates as " Emperor of Konkan of 900 villages lying between Kundalika river in Ratnagiri district to Gangavali."

(3) " It must, however, be remembered that only that portion of the district now known as North-Kanara which lies south of Gangavali and between the Sahyadris and the Sea was included in the old province of Kanara." (*vide* page 154 of the *Bombay Gazetteer*, Kanara Vol. XV, Part II, 1883).

(4) " Desh or Deccan which includes the seven above the Ghat districts of Nasik, Poona, Satara, Sholapur, Ahmednagar and East and West Khandesh, is the home-land of Marathi language and culture and has a homogeneous and political outlook and aspiration. Konkan, which includes below the Ghat talukas of Thana district, Bombay City and Suburban districts, Ratnagiri and Kolaba and extends up to South Kanara, has a dialect of its own called Konkani." [*vide* page 10 paragraph 50 of the report of the Linguistic Provinces Commission (1948)].

(5) " Marathi occupies an irregular triangular area of approximately 100,000 sq. miles having its apex about the district of Balaghat in the Central Provinces, and for its base the Western Coast of the Peninsula from Daman on the

Gulf of Cambay in the north to Karwar on the open Arabian Sea in the South. It covers parts of two provinces of British India—Bombay and Central Provinces (including Berar)—with numerous settlers in Central India and Madras, and is also the principal language of Portuguese India and of the north-western portion of His Highness the Nizam's dominions. The standard form of speech is that of Poona in Bombay and in its various dialects it covers the larger part of that province.” (*vide* Encyclopaedia Britanica, Vol. 14 “Marathi”, pages 856-857, Edition 1959).

Since the descriptions from the Imperial Gazetteer to which the Government of Mysore have referred are not mentioned, no comments could be offered.

6.104. It would be relevant to mention here that historical considerations do not seem to be of much significance for the purpose of delimitation of States on linguistic basis. Marathas ruled over Bangalore, Kolar, Tanjore, etc. in the South and over Baroda, Indore (Gwalior) in the North but Maharashtra today cannot and do not claim any of them. Similarly even if it be true that certain Kannada dynasties ruled over this Konkani-Marathi tract in the past, that cannot by itself be a criterion for its linguistic link up with the State of Mysore. That the ruling dynasties have never been able to give their language to the masses is repeatedly proved by history. India under Khiljis, Taghlakhs or Moguls never adopted their form of speech. Neither could the British convert Indian population to adopt English as their mother-tongue, nor could the Portuguese, even after 400 years of suppression and subjugation, force Goans to discard Konkani-Marathi in favour of Portuguese. That a substantial majority of this Konkani-Marathi tract of Karwar, Supa and Haliyal talukas still maintains their mother-tongue as Konkani-Marathi is itself a pointer to the fact that linguistically and culturally this tract belongs to Maharashtra.

6.105. That the Konkani-speaking people accepted Marathi as their mother-tongue will be seen from the following extract from the address presented on 26th May 1939 by the Karwar Municipality to the then Minister of Education (Shri B. G. Kher).

“ At this stage we may refer to a resolution very recently passed by our Board, praying Government to expedite the introduction of free and compulsory primary education. And if the idea underlying such a system of education is to expand the minds of even the poorest boys through instruction conveyed in their mother-tongue, then we venture to suggest that provision for teaching Marathi on a large scale will have to be made at least for the Karwar taluka and the portions concerned of the adjacent talukas.”

It is most significant that the request was made before the independence when linguistic disputes had not arisen.

The Traditional Literacy

6.106. Again in the recent past, almost all the Village Panchayats and all the three Taluka Development Boards from this Konkani-Marathi area of the three talukas of Karwar, Supa and Haliyal have resolved that Konkani language belongs to Marathi family and the traditional language of the Konkani-speaking people for the literary purposes is Marathi only.

Periodicals

6.107. The periodicals published in an area and medium used for them are another pointer of traditional literary language of the people of that area. There have been many attempts in Karwar since 1885 to have local periodicals and all of them with the exception of “Nagarik” which was published from 1955 to 1965 in Kannada, were in Marathi. Now only one periodical “Vichari” which is in its 72nd year is being published thrice a month in Karwar. This is entirely in Marathi and is conducted and edited by a Muslim family. Other Marathi periodicals which were published from time to time were as under:—

- (1) *Satya Sudha*—1885-1887—Fortnightly,
- (2) *Karwar Samachar*—1887-1893—Weekly,
- (3) *Akhand Samadhan*—1909—9 months only—A Magazine devoted to religion and philosophy,
- (4) *Nagarik*—1932-irregularly published and stopped.

Almost all the Marathi dailies, weeklies, fortnightlies and monthlies, Diwali and special issues published in Bombay, Poona, etc. have their selling agencies in Karwar.

Libraries

6.108. There are not many libraries in the Konkani-Marathi tract of Karwar, Supa and Haliyal talukas. The biggest one is the Karwar General Library which has a very large number of English Books. Marathi and Kannada books were almost equal in number, leaning however towards Marathi by a handful of more but since 1956 the number of Kannada books shows a phenomenal increase owing to the Mysore Government's grants to libraries. However across the river, in a public library at Chitakula, established and conducted by the local population, there are 1,723 Marathi books as against a hundred and odd Kannada ones.

6.109. In Karwar, there is only one Literary Association—Marathi Vangmaya Mandal—which has a library of only Marathi and Sanskrit books. The Marathi section has nearly 1,600 books.

Records in Marathi

6.110. It is understood that—

(1) all the Land Records, Sale Deeds, etc. were kept in Marathi only since times immemorial till about 1921 when Kannadisation started;

(2) some Land Records are still kept in Marathi only;

(3) when the North Kanara district was separated in 1862 with its Headquarters at Karwar, there were only Marathi schools and the population used to have education in Marathi;

(4) local institutions started by Karwar public like the Urban Co-operative Bank Ltd., Karwar, keep their records and maintain their correspondence, accounts, annual balance-sheet, etc. in Marathi only. Similar is the case with small or big institutions or associations or Mandals in various villages where the only medium used is Marathi;

(5) even Karwar Taluka Congress Committee's records were kept in Marathi right from its inception in 1922 till recently when they are reported to have been changed to Kannada.

6.111. In Karwar taluka, Kannada is known only to a few who have continuous contact with Government offices or courts. With the few exceptions of imported Government Kannada staff everyone can speak Konkani and understand Marathi. Mass contact in this taluka can, therefore, be established only through the medium of Konkani or Marathi. This is borne out by the various hand-bills distributed, advertising new films in cinema theatres or circus, posters for fair and important pujas in temples, election posters which are all generally in Marathi.

6.112. In paragraph 194, the representatives of the Government of Mysore on the Four-man Committee have quoted 120 Kannada Primary Schools and 61 Marathi Primary Schools as the material evidence to hold a view that 2/3rds of the people in Karwar taluka have taken to Kannada education. The number of primary schools and the students taking either Marathi or Kannada education cannot be accepted as material evidence to support the view of the Government of Mysore representatives for the following reasons:

Mr. Justice L. S. Misra has at page 16 of his report on "Bellary Taluq" observed as under in this connection:—

"The other two points concerning the secondary language and accounts have no force. The former depends upon the education policy of the State or the Municipal Board and it appears that they (Kannadigas) have adopted Telugu because it offers greater scope for employment in the State Services."

Since the reorganisation of the States, the Government of Mysore have not opened a single Marathi Primary School in these three talukas in spite of the demand from the Konkani-Marathi people. Whatever increase in the number of Marathi Primary Schools in this area has taken place is entirely due to the efforts made by the voluntary bodies. It is to be remembered that these voluntary bodies had to strive hard to open schools as no encouragement was given by the Government.

Caste Structure

6.113. The caste structure of the Konkani-speaking community in the Konkani-Marathi tract of Karwar, Supa and Haliyal talukas is distinctly Maharashtrian and their blood-ties are also, besides Konkani-speaking, with the Marathi-speaking people.

6.114. The Government of Mysore are of the view that it may be that Saraswaths had affinity with the social and cultural traditions of Maharashtra and Karnatak. But the special interest of North Kanara population centres in the primitive classes such as Halavakki-Vakkals, Gram-Vakkals, Halepaiks, Kumarpaiks, Mukris, and Harkantras who have much in common with the population of Malbar and South Kanara but very little affinity with the rest of the Maharashtra State.

Throughout the North Kanara district, according to the Government of Mysore, the cult of the people is of worshipping goddesses like Durgamma, Marikamba, Badadamma, Dyamavva, Mariyamma, Udchamma, etc. The temples dedicated to these goddesses are found in these three talukas. The local people hold their own fairs with peculiar customs of worship mostly resembling the Dravidian customs and manners. The Shivaratri fair at Ulvi (situated in the Supa taluka) attracts a large number of people from adjoining districts of Belgaum, Bijapur and Dharwar. Dasara, Suggi-Habba, Bandi Habba and other festivals are annually observed by the local people here. The folk songs which express both sentiments and emotions of the people are purely Kannada in character and have nothing in common with similar songs popular in Maharashtra. Yakshagana is the most popular form of entertainment both in rural and urban parts of North Kanara district. The Government of Mysore are, therefore, of the view that this Konkani-Marathi tract has everything common with the South Kanara district and has many features which distinguish it from the districts of Maharashtra, namely, Ratnagiri and Kolaba.

6.115. In paragraph 183 of their report the representatives of the Mysore Government on the Four-man Committee state that culturally major part of the Karwar district has affinities with Kannada districts of Dharwar, Belgaum etc. and also with the districts of old Mysore area. They have also mentioned some

communities residing in the Konkani-Marathi tract of Karwar, Supa and Haliyal talukas which are the followers of H. H. Sri Shankaracharya Mutt of Sringeri in Chikmagalur district and Veera-Siva, Jagadguru of Chitradurga Mutt and opined that they (communities) have mixed with the local people and their affinities have grown and developed towards Kannada areas.

6.116. The primitive classes referred to by the Government of Mysore which are predominant in the rest of the Karwar district, are conspicuously absent in this Konkani-Marathi tract of Karwar, Supa and Haliyal talukas. It is also understood that—

(i) as in the case of Maharashtra, Marathas, Bhandaris, Gabits, Padtis and Maharashtra Brahmins are concentrated in this tract;

(ii) there have been quite a good number of temples of gods and goddesses which are worshipped by the Maharashtrians, approved by Government for annual donations since almost the fifties of the 19th century in these talukas ;

(iii) there are also similar temples which were either excluded from the approved list or built later;

(iv) there are almost no temples dedicated to gods and goddesses like Marikamba, Durgamma, Dyamavva, etc. worshipped by Kannadigas;

(v) the number of temples dedicated to the deities worshipped by the Maharashtrians and Kannadigas in this Konkani-Marathi tract is as under—

Taluka	No. of temples dedicated to deities worshipped		
	By Maharashtrians	By Kannadigas	
1	2	3	
Karwar	.. *23+19	5	*These are the temples approved by the Government for annual grants.
Supa	.. 35	2	
Haliyal	.. 13	..	

Temples mentioned in column 2 above are dedicated to Mahadev, Shankar, Maruti, Shivanath, Durga Devi, Ganapati, Mahamaya, Vithoba, etc. Out of the temples mentioned in column 3, there are two Basava Maths or temples—one at Ulvi in Supa taluka and the other at Shirve in Karwar taluka. They are situated in the heart of dense forests and are visited by outsiders as admitted by the Government of Mysore themselves. They are not worshipped by the local population.

6.117. Thread and marriage ceremonies, funeral rites, observance of holy days like Gudi Padva, Ganesh Chaturthi, Ram Navami, Gokulashtami, Navaratra, Narali-Pournima, Diwali, Hanuman Jayanti, Dasa Navami, Makar Sankranti, Shimga, etc. Marathi Kirtans, Aratis, Bhajans and Pravachanas in almost every temple, recitations from Dnyaneshwar, Tukaram, Ramdas and Shridhar and food, apparel of gents and ladies—all these would convince any lay visitor from Maharashtra or any other part of India that the character of this society is Maharashtrian to the core.

6.118. Another important pointer would be the names of males and females in this area. This is easy to find from the voters' list published by Government from time to time. A close scrutiny may be made of these names and separate lists prepared one of male names ending in Appa, Ayya and Gouda and female names ending in Avva, Akka and Amma and another list without these appellations. Kannada male names usually conform to types like Bhimappa, Hanamayya, Narsinhagouda and so on and female names, Yellamma, Halavva, Chinnakka and so on. This scrutiny will convince any one that there is just a sprinkling of Kannada sociological groups on a vast Maharashtrian social structure.

Economic Considerations

6.119. Economically the Konkani-Marathi tract of Karwar, Supa and Haliyal talukas is linked with Bombay, Maharashtra and Konkan. It is understood that 90 per cent of the merchandise is brought from Bombay. Many of the educated people look to Bombay and Maharashtra for employment. Cases of such persons going on their own to seek employment either in Bangalore or

Mysore or in other places in the Mysore State are less obviously because of the language difficulty. Timber and fish—fresh as well as salted—are sent to Bombay market only. Ship-builders of this area cater to the needs of the people on the coast-line (i.e. Vengurla, Ratnagiri and other places and their connections to other places in South in Mysore are few.

Deficit Area

6.120. In paragraph 187 of their report, the Mysore representatives on the Four-man Committee have stated that the whole Karwar district is a deficit area. There are other coastal districts in the Maharashtra State which are economically backward and deficit in food. It is not, therefore, a peculiar feature of the areas of Karwar district claimed by the Government of Maharashtra and the Government of Maharashtra would certainly be interested in developing this tract when transferred to the Maharashtra State, along with other coastal tract. The point raised, however, is not relevant.

Analogy of Coorg

6.121. In paragraph 344 of its report the States Reorganisation Commission has recommended inclusion of Coorg in the Karnatak State (named as Mysore State in the S. R. Act). The premises on which the Commission made this recommendation are as under:

“The affiliations of this State (Coorg) are predominantly with Karnatak. Kannada-speaking people form the largest linguistic group in the State accounting for 35 per cent of its population, Coorgi or Kodagu, which is spoken by about 29 per cent of its people is akin to Kannada and is regarded by some authorities as a dialect of Kannad. Culturally, Coorg had more links with the east, which is mainly Karnatak country, than with the west and the south and geographically the whole of Coorg forms a part of Malnad which belongs essentially to Karnatak.”

The Government of India had accepted this recommendation and Coorg is now a part of the Mysore State.

No reasons given by S. R. C. for inclusion of this area in Mysore

6.122. In Chapter IV of the States Reorganisation Commission's Report no specific reasons have been indicated for inclusion of Karwar, Supa and Haliyal in Mysore territory. As pointed out earlier in this chapter, these three talukas form a compact and contiguous territory and also have affiliations—social, cultural and traditional—as well as linguistic homegeneity with the Maharashtra State. Besides, the Karwar, Supa and Haliyal talukas have 71·5 per cent, 82·5 per cent and 59·2 per cent of the Marathi-speaking people respectively of the population. This Konkani Marathi tract as a whole has 71·2 per cent of Marathi-speaking people. These percentages are far in excess of the Kannada-speaking population of these three talukas individually and the tract as a whole. The Kannada populations of these three talukas individually are 22·6 per cent, 8 per cent and 22·8 per cent and the average percentage of the Kannada-speaking people of this tract as a whole is only 17·8. It is thus obvious that the reasons which prompted the States Reorganisation Commission to recommend the inclusion of Coorg in the Karnatak State hold good with much greater force in the case of this tract. Notwithstanding this, the States Reorganisation Commission has not given to this tract the treatment given to the Coorg State. It is also relevant to point out here that Coorgi or Kodagu which is spoken by about 29 per cent of the population of Coorg, is akin to Kannada and is regarded by some authorities as a dialect of Kannada, is accepted by the States Reorganisation Commission as one of the grounds for recommending inclusion of Coorg in Mysore. It is the claim of the Government of Maharashtra that Konkani is a dialect of Marathi and none would deny that it is akin to Marathi. The Government of Maharashtra's claim for transfer of the Konkani-Marathi tract of Karwar, Supa and Haliyal talukas to the Maharashtra State is thus quite in keeping with the States Reorganisation Commission's recommendation and the Government of India's decision to include Coorg in Mysore.

Wishes of the People

6.123. The population of this Konkani-Marathi tract has been agitating for the inclusion of these three talukas of Karwar, Supa

and Haliyal in Maharashtra since the date the question of formation of linguistic States arose. A few occasions when resolutions for transfer of this tract to Bombay (Maharashtra) State were passed are mentioned below:—

- (i) Karnatak Prantiya Parishad held at Karwar in 1947;
- (ii) Maharashtra Ekikaran Parishad held in January 1950;
- (iii) The Marathi Sahitya Sammelan—24th Session—held at Karwar in May 1951;
- (iv) Gomantak Marathi Sahitya Sammelan held in May 1954.

Since the formation of the new Mysore State the Marathi-speaking people have held numerous conferences during this period and passed resolutions urging for inclusion of their area in Maharashtra. They have also submitted several representations with the same object to the various authorities in the Government of India, to the Governments of Maharashtra and Mysore, to the Prime Minister, the Home Minister and the President of the Congress. They had sent deputations to Delhi to focus the attention of the leaders on the demand for inclusion of their area in Maharashtra. They have also fought elections to the Legislative Assembly of the Mysore State and the Taluka Development Boards on this issue and successfully demonstrated their will to be included in the Maharashtra State. In February 1957, the General Elections were held to the Mysore Legislative Assembly. In the North Kanara District the Marathi-Konkani speaking areas claimed by this Government are Karwar, Supa and Haliyal (except some portions on the eastern borders of the talukas). The seat was contested by a Congress candidate, a Praja Socialist Party candidate, an Independent candidate and a Samiti candidate. The Congress was then able to secure a Konkani-speaking candidate but he won by only a margin of 492 votes against the Samiti candidate.

In 1960, elections were held in the border areas in the Mysore State to elect representatives to the Taluka Development Boards. In the Karwar and Supa talukas, the Maharashtra Ekikaran Samiti won all the seats it contested. In the Haliyal Taluka, it won 13 out of 15 seats.

The Taluka Development Board of Karwar consisted of 15 members out of whom three represented Kannada area. This Board had, however, unanimously passed a resolution for merger with the Bombay (Maharashtra) State on 28th February 1961. The resolution passed by the Board is reproduced below:—

“RESOLUTION No. 6.—Konkani belongs to the Marathi family. The Konkani people of Karwar, Haliyal and Supa have given their allegiance to Marathi only as their literary and traditional language. Great injustice has been done to this overwhelmingly, i.e. 72 per cent Marathi area by its being tacked on (sic.) Kannada Mysore State ignoring the persistent demand of these people to be joined to Maharashtra. Educational, cultural and economic uplift of this Marathi area will only be in the Marathi region. This meeting reiterates our Maharashtra Ekikaran Samiti's demand that this Marathi area along with the neighbouring Belgaum, Khanapur, Nipani, Bidar, Bhalki area be immediately merged in Maharashtra State. The meeting is of the opinion that if this is not done early, the culture and language of our people will be ruined.”

Similar resolutions were also passed by the Taluka Development Boards of Supa and Haliyal Talukas. The Karwar Taluka Development Board has again on 27th December 1966 passed a resolution reiterating its earlier resolutions including the one quoted above.

Almost all the Village Panchayats in these three talukas have passed resolutions for merger of their villages in the Maharashtra State.

In the general elections of 1962, the Maharashtra Ekikaran Samiti won one seat in the Marathi-Konkani majority tract of Karwar district. In this constituency, the total votes polled were 33,262. Out of this, 20,510 were secured by the Maharashtra Ekikaran Samiti and 12,752 i.e. 38·4 per cent only were secured by the Congress.

Formerly the Karwar constituency consisted of Karwar and Supa talukas and 36 villages from Haliyal taluka. The whole of this area is claimed by the Government of Maharashtra. According to the Delimitation of Parliamentary and Assembly Constituencies

Order, 1965, Mysore, the Karwar constituency consists of Karwar and Supa talukas and Haliyal constituency consists of Haliyal, Yellapur and Mundgod talukas. Yellapur and Mundgod talukas are essentially Kannad-speaking areas. In the General Elections of 1967, the Maharashtra Ekikaran Samiti candidate from Karwar constituency won the Assembly seat. The total votes polled were 36,838. He secured 23,079 votes, while his immediate rival Congress candidate secured 13,759 votes. It was a straight contest between Maharashtra Ekikaran Samiti and the Congress.

6.124. According to the minutes of the meeting between the Chief Minister of Maharashtra and the Members of the Four-Man Committee kept by the Government of Maharashtra representatives, it is understood, that the Mysore representatives' version as given in paragraph 122 of their report does not seem to be accurate. The Chief Minister's reply was that the greatest advantage to the Konkani-speaking people would be that they would be satisfied and that satisfaction of the people is a great advantage. He further said that cultural development would also be advanced.

Kalinadi Project

6.125. In paragraph 77 of their "Views on the Border Disputes between the States of Maharashtra and Mysore", the Government of Mysore have among others stated the following two principles:—

(1) Irrespective of linguistic considerations the area required for head-works, reservoirs, etc. of existing or proposed irrigation or power projects should be included in the State in which area benefiting from such irrigation or power project is situated;

(2) Irrespective of linguistic considerations the villages required for any installations connected with water supply, power supply or sewage disposal of a city should form part of the State in which such a city is included.

In paragraph 64, the Government of Mysore have made the following observations:—

"Dandeli which is the centre of the forest departmental activities is linked with Alnavar, a railway station in Karnatak. Power for industries in Dandeli is being supplied by the Hydro-Electric Works at Jog Falls. The most important point to be

considered in this connection is the Kalinadi Hydro-Electric Project which is proposed to be undertaken by the Mysore Government during the Third Five Year-Plan. It will have its head-works in the Supa taluka. It is expected to serve the needs of a large part of the Mysore State. While re-adjusting territories, care has to be taken to see that the industrial and economic life or the potentialities of these parts of the State remain unaffected. If this area is, by misfortune, separated from the Kannada region, it will never be developed as any project located in the Supa Taluka is not likely to serve the needs of Maharashtra. It is the Mysore State alone which can develop and utilise this project not only for the development of the Malnad tract but also other areas of the State. For all these reasons, the three talukas of the North Kanara district must be retained in the Mysore State.”

The representatives of the Government of Mysore on the Four-Man Committee have stated that in view of the acute power shortage in the Mysore State the Kalinadi Hydro-Electric Project is receiving urgent attention of that Government. They have also stated that the existing Hydro-power potential in the Mysore State is too short to meet the demands and that it is, therefore, absolutely necessary for Mysore to exploit all possible Hydro-power potentials in the State to meet their needs and for the development of the State. They have further added that the Government of Maharashtra have agreed to the principles mentioned in the preceding paragraph in the allotment of Marathi areas to Gujarat in connection with the Ukai Project.

The principles on the basis of which the Government of Maharashtra have claimed Supa, Haliyal and Karwar talukas of the North Kanara district have been indicated earlier. One of the principles is the relative majority of Marathi-speaking people. In Supa taluka 82·5 per cent of the population speak Marathi while only 8 per cent speak Kannad language. Similarly, in Haliyal taluka 59·2 per cent speak Marathi whereas only 22·8 per cent speak Kannad and in Karwar taluka 71·5 per cent speak Marathi as against 22·6 per cent who speak Kannad. Thus all the three talukas of Supa, Haliyal and Karwar have Marathi-speaking people

in majority. Even taking the three talukas together 71 per cent of population speak Marathi whereas 17·8 per cent speak Kannad. It is, therefore, the legitimate and rational claim of the Government of Maharashtra that on the basis of the linguistic homogeneity along with the principles of contiguity and wishes of the people, the predominantly Marathi-speaking areas of the three talukas be transferred to the State of Maharashtra. If the percentages of the Marathi-speaking people in the areas of these talukas proposed to be transferred to Maharashtra are worked out, they would surely be still higher (Supa 84 per cent, Haliyal 67 per cent and Karwar 78 per cent).

It will be seen from the map No. 6, Appendix I indicating the suggested line of demarcation of the boundary between the States of Maharashtra and Mysore that almost the entire project including the head-works and the areas of submergence falls within the area claimed by the Government of Maharashtra. It may also be noted that much the greater part of the length of Kalinadi falls within the Marathi-speaking zone and only a small length of the river is the common boundary between the Marathi and Kannad Zones. At best, there would seem to be a case for a few odd villages with Kannad-majority on the western side of the river being included in the Marathi-speaking zone for convenience. The Kalinadi Project should, therefore, go to the State in which Supa is included. It cannot be the need of the project which should decide the State in which the talukas of Supa, Haliyal and Karwar should be included.

To make the position clear, some details of the project are given here below:

The Government of Bombay (Maharashtra) had undertaken a survey of the Kalinadi Project some years ago. According to that survey, it is not a multi-purpose project but only a Hydro-Electric Project. This project consists of four schemes, namely, (1) Supa Dam and Power Station, (2) Nagjhiri Scheme, (3) Kaneri Scheme and (4) Lower Kalinadi Scheme. Of the four schemes, three are situated in the overwhelmingly Marathi-speaking portion—the Supa taluka—while the fourth is in the Haliyal taluka where

Marathi-speaking people are in absolute majority. The Kalinadi-Hydro-Electrical Project has a potentiality for a totalled installed capacity of nearly 6,00,000 K.W. Kalinadi is one of the west-flowing rivers and is, therefore, particularly suitable for Hydro-power generation. Such a large bulk of power will have obviously to be transmitted by high voltage line. A 220 K.V. line is normally regarded suitable for transmission of power without undue loss upto 200-Mile radius. The distance between Kalinadi and Koyna will be less than 150 miles and it would be perfectly feasible to join this block of power to the Koyna power. The entire districts of Kolhapur, Satara, Sholapur and large part of Ratnagiri district fall within the radius of 200 miles of Kalinadi Project. Besides, once this power is fed into Koyna Grid, it could be used anywhere according to the need over the Kalinadi-Koyna-Bombay Grid. Further, Maharashtra which is very much short of power would be in a better position to fully utilise the power generated from the Kalinadi Project. This amply brings out Maharashtra's need for power and its interest in the execution of this project. The contention of the Government of Mysore that it is the Mysore State alone which can develop this project is therefore presumptuous. There is no reason why the mere existence of the project site in Supa and Haliyal talukas or the contemplated use of power and water from the project in the adjoining areas of Karnataka should be allowed to overrule the general principle of linguistic homogeneity on the basis of which these talukas should go to Maharashtra.

The total cost of the Kalinadi Project was estimated at Rs. 39.3 crores in August 1961 *vide* paragraph 33 on page 240 of the Government of Mysore—Third Five-Year Plan, Vol. I. The estimated cost of this project was subsequently revised to Rs. 90 crores. In the Fourth Five-Year Plan of the Government of Mysore of Rs. 500 crores (reduced to Rs. 421 crores by the Planning Commission), the proposed outlay for this project is Rs. 16.76 crores *vide* p. 68 of the preliminary Memorandum of the Fourth Five-Year Plan of the Mysore State. The Government of Maharashtra with greater financial resources at its command would be in a better position to undertake this project especially as it has all along suffered from shortage of power.

Even after the completion of all the phases of the Koyna-Hydro-Electric Project, the State of Maharashtra would continue to suffer from shortage of power. In contrast, the State of Mysore is placed in a better position as it has surplus power and would continue to have the surplus for a number of years, as is evident from the quotation given below:

In paragraph 9.95 of the Techno-Economic Survey of Mysore (1963) by the National Council of Economic Research, New Delhi, it is stated that Mysore has an abundant Hydro potential of about 5.35 million K.W. In paragraph 9.100 of the same publication, it is stated as under:—

“It would be obvious from the above that the Hydro potential available in Mysore is more than adequate to meet the power requirements of the State for the two decades.”

Two things are clear—(1) the contention of the Mysore representatives on the Four-Man Committee that there is acute shortage of power in the Mysore State is not correct and (2) the need of Maharashtra for power is genuine and pressing.

The villages in the West Khandesh district of the former State of Bombay which have been included in Gujarat lay in the area of submergence of the Ukai Project in the Gujarat State. These villages were to be depopulated. For the sake of smooth execution of the Ukai Project, it was agreed that these villages should go to Gujarat State. Besides, Gujarat State is the sole beneficiary State and it was legitimate that the burden of responsibility of payment of compensation and rehabilitation of persons displaced by submergence should be shouldered by Gujarat only. The case of Kalinadi Project *visa-a-vis* Supa taluka is not at all on par with the Ukai Project *visa-a-vis* the Marathi-speaking villages included in the Gujarat State.

Karwar Town

6.126. In paragraph 63 of their “Views on the Border Disputes between the States of Maharashtra and Mysore”, the Government of Mysore have stated that in view of the facilities of communication and its potentialities for development, Karwar has been chosen as headquarters of North Kanara district and has,

therefore, gained an importance of its own. It has road connections with Belgaum and Dharwar. It has no geographical contiguity with any part of Maharashtra and is linked with Dharwar and Hubli for its trade communications.

6.127. As mentioned in paragraph 6·98 earlier, Karwar is already well-connected with Belgaum and the Maharashtra State. The contention of the Government of Mysore that Karwar has no geographical contiguity with any part of Maharashtra has also been already dealt with earlier in paragraphs 6·96 & 6·97.

Karwar is situated at the northern-most-end of the district. The District Central Co-operative Bank, the Divisional Office of the State Transport, the West Coast National Highway Office, etc., are already located either in Sirsi or in Kumta which clearly shows that Karwar is not considered convenient by the Mysore Government as District Headquarters.

6.128. The representatives of the Government of Mysore on the Four-Man Committee state that transfer of Karwar to another State will reduce Karwar itself to a position of insignificance and that shifting of headquarters to any other place in Mysore will involve double loss to the Nation. Three questions have been posed by the Mysore representatives, viz. (1) Whether transfer of Karwar to Maharashtra is necessary and justified? (2) Is it worthwhile for Karwar to undergo this sacrifice? and (3) What is the compensation to Karwar for its being relegated to an insignificant position?

6.129. The Mysore representatives themselves have given a reply to their first question by saying that there is no answer to this unless it be that transfer enlarges the field of homogeneity. It is the linguistic homogeneity along with the contiguity and the wishes of the people that justifies the transfer of Karwar to Maharashtra.

As regards the remaining 2 questions it is worthwhile to know whether the Government of Mysore hold a similar view in respect of their claim for Kasargod taluka. It is however a fact that the people from the Karwar, Supa and Haliyal talukas have been agitating long since for merger of their talukas with Maharashtra. This in itself is a conclusive evidence to show that they

are not happy with their present position. It must be presumed that they know what is best for them and if knowing what is best for them, they seek the inclusion of Karwar, Supa and Haliyal talukas in Maharashtra, their wishes will have to prevail, for, wishes of the people is one of the foremost principles in any democratic Government.

6.130. It is stated that the port of Karwar, which the Government of Mysore propose to develop, is the natural outlay for not only forest, mineral and agricultural wealth of the coastal and Malnad tract but also for the produce and minerals of the districts of Dharwar, Bijapur, Bellary and Raichur. The representatives of Mysore Government have alleged that so long as Karwar port was within the State of Bombay and so long as Bombay was holding the keys of Government, the chances of its development were very few and Karwar did not, therefore, develop in any manner during the British regime. Since 1956, the Government of Mysore have planned to develop Karwar during the Third Plan. They fear that if it is transferred to Maharashtra, it will be cut off from the hinterland comprising the districts of North Kanara, Belgaum, Dharwar and Bellary and may not develop as a big port. They have, therefore, concluded that Karwar and its hinterland stand to lose considerably by the proposed transfer of Karwar to Maharashtra which will naturally have no urge to develop Karwar as it already possesses a big port like Bombay.

6.131. The development of Karwar port as a major port is the responsibility of the Union Government *vide* Entry No. 27 in List I in the Schedule of the Constitution of India. The development of Karwar port as a major port will, therefore, depend upon the criteria adopted by the Government of India for the purpose. The Government of India would certainly see that certain prerequisites such as rail link, are fulfilled before taking a policy decision. The application of the criteria will be according to the national policy and not according to the interests of individual States. The Government of Mysore's contention that Karwar will not be developed as a port if it goes to Maharashtra is therefore not correct. Even if Karwar is to be developed as a minor port the Government of Maharashtra will be in a better position to do so.

6.132. In paragraph 193 of their report the Mysore representatives have opined that apart from the controversy about the affinity of Konkani language, Karwar town ought to go to Mysore in preference to Maharashtra on the ground of linguistic homogeneity. It is stated in this connection that Kannada-speaking population is 28·2 per cent while Marathi-speaking population is 17·6 per cent. Even the Konkani-speaking population is less than half being 45·8 per cent. They have further stated that if the town is left out whether the remaining villages claimed which are all Konkani-speaking deserved to be detached and transferred to Maharashtra.

6.133. Karwar town and the villages in the Karwar taluka have been claimed by the Government of Maharashtra on the basis that Konkani language is a dialect of and in any case akin to Marathi and that Konkani and Marathi population together is more than Kannad-speaking population.

6.134. It is worthwhile to mention here that the question about medium to be adopted in the Karwar Municipal Office had been vexing the District Collector and the Karwar Municipality almost for the last Century. The decision taken in 1948 is "to adopt Marathi as the Vernacular of the Karwar Municipal District, and the Municipal work and correspondence be adjusted accordingly", *vide* the relevant extract quoted below from 'Karwar Municipality Centenary Souvenir' at pages 72-73:—

"The question of medium is found discussed from very early times. The bilingual character of the town was realized, though, as Government language, Kannada was adopted. Even then twenty years later, in connection with the proposed election, the Collector is found to have asked the Municipal office, whether any Marathi forms were necessary. In August 1884, the question came up whether the accounts should be written in English, Canarese or Marathi and it was decided that the collection accounts at nakas be written in Canarese as all Naka Karkuns know Canarese. Five hundred voting papers printed in Kanarese were brought from Bombay for the first election in 1889.

However, it was decided that the election rules be translated in Kanarese and Marathi and five copies of each be sent to the

Mamlatdar for being forwarded to the respective Shanbhogs. The Municipal Rules, Bye-laws for Registration of births and deaths and the Market Rules were published in both these languages. A Marathi copy of the Municipal Act II of 1884 and Act VI of 1873 was purchased and the notice under section 69 of 1873 was given publicity in Kanarese and Marathi. Municipal Bye-Laws were translated in Kannad by Diwan Bahadur V. D. Yennemadi in 1913 and in Marathi by Shri Achut Vaman Sabnis in 1933.

So far this language question was solved by taking the line of least resistance. But in 1946 it took a controversial turn and by a majority of votes it was decided that the address to Minister, G. D. Tapase should be given in Marathi and to M. P. Patil in Kannada as he was Karnataki gentleman. This controversy reached such a pitch that a resolution was moved on 13th October 1948 seeking 'to adopt Marathi as the vernacular of the Karwar Municipal district, and Municipal work and correspondence be gradually adjusted accordingly'. There were amendments and counter-amendments but it was finally passed the same day."

Haliyal Taluka

6.135. In paragraph 209 of their report, the Mysore representatives state that it is not correct to say that Kulawadi is Marathi and that the figures of Marathi-speaking people in Haliyal taluka as well as in Supa taluka have assumed exaggerated proportions because of the inclusion of Kulawadi-speaking people in the Marathi-speaking people. The following extracts from Volume VII of the Linguistic Survey of India compiled and edited by G. A. Grierson will show that the contention of Mysore representatives is contrary to the finding of the author of this Linguistic Survey:—

"BROKEN DIALECTS OF THE DEKHAN"

"In the south and east Marathi borders on Kanarese, and in Bijapur and Dharwar we meet with dialects which have, to a small extent, been influenced by that language. This influence is, however, not very important. The chief result which it has effected is a weakening of the sense of gender, and a confusion

between the active and passive constructions of transitive verbs.” (page 47).

“The Marathi Kumbis in the Dharwar and Kalghatgi talukas in the west of the district bordering on Kanara are said to speak a dialect called Kulvadi.....”

“A list of Standard Words and Phrases in Kulvadi has been received from the Commissioner. It shows that the dialect in some points agrees with the form of Marathi current in the Konkan.....”

“In Other respects Kulvadi does not seem to differ from the usual form of Marathi spoken in the Dekhan.”

“The Marathi dialect of Dharwar is, in some places, influenced by the neighbouring Kanarese. The pronunciation is said to be broad and rough as in that language. The various genders and the different verbal constructions are sometimes confounded.....”

“The two specimens which follow illustrate this mixed form of Marathi. It will be seen that the discrepancies are not very important.” (page 52).

It will be seen from the above that Kulawadi has been correctly treated as part of the Marathi language while compiling the census data and the Kulawadi-speaking people have been correctly included in the Marathi-speaking people of the Haliyal and Supa talukas.

6.136. In paragraph 212 of their report the Mysore representatives have stated that villages Vincholi, Ange, Karwad, Budakanshirda and Harnoda form islands. They have also stated that the central patch of the Haliyal taluka with four villages of Khanapur taluka lying to the North of Haliyal taluka form an island. According to the principle of contiguity this island cannot be claimed by the Government of Maharashtra.

Villages Vincholi and Ange do not form an island as they are not surrounded on all sides by Kannada majority villages. They are surrounded on the south by the Yellapur taluka in Mysore State which is Kannada majority area, on the west by Konkani majority villages in Supa taluka, on the north by Konkani majority villages

and an uninhabited village in Haliyal taluka and on the east by an uninhabited village in Haliyal taluka. Similar is the case with villages Karwad, Badakanshirda and Harnoda. As regards the villages Badakanshirda and Harnoda, they are surrounded on the south by uninhabited villages of Haliyal taluka, on the west by the Konkani majority villages in Supa taluka, on the north by Marathi majority villages, an uninhabited village and a village with relative majority of Kannada-speaking people and on the east by a Kannad relative majority village and an inhabited village. The village Karwad (Dandeli) is contiguous to village Badakanshirda to the south ; on the west it is surrounded by a Marathi majority village and an uninhabited village, on the north and east by uninhabited villages.

6.137. In paragraph 213, the Mysore representatives have stated that Kannada would be a majority language at Dandeli if Telugu and Tamil are considered as allied sister-languages of Kannada.

It is worth noting that the representatives of the Mysore Government themselves are not aware whether Telugu and Tamil are allied to and sister languages of Kannada. Besides, according to the figures of the 1951 census, Dandeli has the following population:—

Marathi	40·1 per cent.
Kannada	10·7 per cent.
Konkani	8·6 per cent.
and Others	40·6 per cent.

Figures of Telugu and Tamil speaking population are included in others and are not available separately. The contention of the representatives is thus without any basis.

6.138. In paragraph 214 of their report the Mysore representatives stated that it would be wrong to cut off Haliyal taluka from the railway Station Alnavar in Dharwar district since the forest produce which is sold at Dandeli has to pass through Alnavar. In this connection, it may be noted that there is no reason to suppose that if Dandeli is transferred to Maharashtra and Alnavar continues to be in the Mysore State, the railway line between Alnavar and

Dandeli will be cut off and that the forest produce cannot, as at present, pass through Alnavar Railway Station.

Grievances

6.139. The Government of Mysore have of their own not opened a single Marathi Primary School since the re-organisation of the States in 1956. The post of Marathi Assistant Deputy Education Inspector was abolished in 1961. Kannad officers have been assigned the responsibility of inspecting and supervising Marathi Primary Schools in the Konkani-Marathi tract. No Marathi knowing member was appointed in spite of representations made on the District Schools Committee set up by the Government of Mysore. These grievances have already been brought to the notice of the Commissioner of Linguistic Minorities, *vide* paragraph 80 of the Sixth Report of the Commissioner. It is found in practice that the Marathi books are published after considerable delay causing inconvenience to Marathi-speaking students. Please also *see* Appendix V.

The Konkani-Marathi tract of Karwar, Supa and Haliyal do not find adequate place in the development programme.

Malnad tract

6.140. The Government of Mysore have argued that the whole of the Malnad tract which covers the Karwar, Haliyal and Supa talukas of the Karwar district should remain under the jurisdiction of the Mysore State for the co-ordinated development of this backward tract. In support of their argument they have stated that the States Reorganisation Commission had recommended that all the parts of the Malnad tract should remain under one administration so that there could be regular programme of development of that area by systematic and scientific plans. The Government of Mysore's views that the Malnad tract covers the talukas of Karwar, Haliyal and Supa does not find support in the book "India and Pakistan" by Mr. L. H. K. Spate. On page 658 of this book it is stated as under:—

"A strip about 6-14 miles wide in the extreme west carries tall evergreen forest, but most of the Malnad (roughly Shimoga,

Kadur and Hussan districts) has a mixed deciduous cover, with teak, sissou, and the most important sandal wood forests of India.”

Further the argument of the States Reorganisation Commission that all the parts of the Malnad tract should remain under one administration so that there could be regular programme for development of that area by systematic and scientific plans is not correct. If the climatic characteristics of a tract are to be the criterion in demarcating the boundaries of States, the present State boundaries will have to be drastically altered. For, it is well known that climatic regions do not coincide with linguistic States. Further, even the present Maharashtra State contains tracts climatically similar to the Malnad tract. If for argument's sake, Belgaum, Khanapur, Karwar, Haliyal and Supa are to be treated as parts of the Malnad tract, as contended by the Government of Mysore, there are tracts in the Maharashtra State contiguous to the Belgaum, Khanapur, Karwar, Haliyal and Supa having identical climatic characteristics.

AREAS IN BIDAR AND GULBARGA DISTRICTS

6.141. According to the Government of Maharashtra certain portions of Aland taluka of Gulbarga district and Humnabad, Bhalki and Santpur talukas of Bidar district in the Mysore State which are predominantly Marathi-speaking, compact and contiguous to the border of Maharashtra should be included in Maharashtra. The facts of the case are as follows.

Background

6.142. The district of Bidar in the erstwhile Hyderabad State was a trilingual district with Marathi-speaking population of 39 per cent, Kanarese population 28 per cent, Telugu 16 per cent and others 15 per cent (unspecified 2 per cent). Thus no single language had more than 50 per cent population and hence the district could not be claimed to be either predominantly Marathi, Kannad or Telugu. It was, therefore, trifurcated and the talukas of Nilanga, Ahmedpur and Udgir were allotted to the Bombay State (Maharashtra), the talukas of Zahirabad and Narayankhed to Andhra Pradesh and the remaining talukas of Bidar, Bhalki, Santpur and

Humnabad to the Mysore State. However, in Bidar taluka the revenue circle of Nyalkal was predominantly Telugu while in Zahirabad taluka the revenue circle of Nirna was predominantly Kannad. The Telugu and Kannad members of the Hyderabad State Assembly agreed in 1956 to exchange these revenue circles. Similarly, mutual adjustments were made in respect of Bichkonda and Jukkal circles of Deglur taluka, Mudhol, Bhiansa and Kuber circles of Mudhol taluka and Islapur circle of Boath taluka, by agreement among the members representing Marathwada area and the Telugu area in the State Assembly. No such adjustments could, however, be made by the members representing Marathwada and Kannad areas in the Assembly with the result that some areas of Humnabad, Bhalki, Santpur and Aland talukas having a preponderance of Marathi-speaking people and contiguity with the State of Bombay (Maharashtra) came to be included in the State of Mysore. The fact to be noted is that a majority of the Marathi-speaking villages of these talukas were formerly a part of Jagir administration under Osmanaabad district which is predominantly a Marathi-speaking district. It was only after abolition of Jagirs in 1949 that the villages were grouped with Kannad villages and bilingual talukas were formed. The people of these villages have therefore been agitating since the reorganisation of States in 1956 for inclusion of their villages in the State of Bombay (Maharashtra).

Details of areas claimed

6.143. The Government of Maharashtra have proposed that 8 villages in Aland taluka of Gulbarga district and 28 villages in Humnabad taluka, 49 in Bhalki taluka and 69 in Santpur taluka of Bidar district in the Mysore State should be transferred to Maharashtra. According to the 1951 Census, the 8 villages of Aland taluka have a population of 4,978 of which 68 per cent is Marathi-speaking and 24 per cent is Kannad-speaking. The 28 villages in Humnabad taluka have a population of 22,303 with 63 per cent Marathi-speaking and 16 per cent Kannad-speaking. In the 49 villages of Bhalki taluka out of a population of 47,879, 59 per cent is Marathi-speaking and 30 per cent Kannad-speaking. In the Santpur taluka, the 69 villages have a population of 46,669, of which 60 per cent are Marathi-speaking and 26 per cent Kannad-speaking.

Connections with Maharashtra

6.144. The chief crops of this area are cotton, ground-nut and jowar and the important trade centres for the villagers are Udgir, Ahmedpur, Latur and Nanded in Maharashtra. The villages are 500-600 miles away from Bangalore, capital of Mysore State, whereas the distance from Bombay, capital of Maharashtra, is about 300-350 miles. The 8 villages in Aland taluka proposed for inclusion in Maharashtra are nearer to Omerga in Maharashtra, than Aland, their present taluka headquarters. They have trade connections with Omerga, Murum, Gunjoti and Sholapur in Maharashtra. The medium of instruction in the schools is Marathi and the children go to places like Omerga, Latur, Udgir, Degloor, Nanded, AUSA, Nilanga, Osmanabad and Aurangabad in Maharashtra for higher education. As they pass their S. S. C. Examination from Centres in Maharashtra, they are not admitted to the technical schools at Bidar. Aurad (Santpur) taluka was constituted after 1950 by the then Hyderabad Government on administrative grounds by combining 40-60 villages from the then Udgir taluka with other villages of Jagir area. The people of Marathi Majority area use Marathi in business and daily chores. Accounts of tradesman and village records are in Marathi. Old records are in *Modi script. It is reported that in Courts 75 per cent of the depositions are in Marathi, 20 per cent in Hindi or Urdu and 5 per cent in Kannad. It is thus clear that the convenience of these people lies in their being included in Maharashtra.

Hardships

6.145. Only four days after the new State of Mysore came into being, the Secretary of the people's Democratic Front, Marathwada Region, who was an M.L.A. had reason to complain to the Chief Minister of Mysore that the D. S. P., Bidar, had started refusing, even before 1st November 1956, to accept applications from the concerned areas in Marathi, demanding that they should be in Kannad or English. He stated that similar incidents were taking place at other offices also. When the Mysore Government decided in 1958 to make the teaching of Kannad

* 'Modi' is a swift script of Marathi which was used in old days.

compulsory from the fourth standard, the people of this area represented that the students "since the time of their ancestors never have been in touch with the Kannad language." In 1960, the Mysore Government had constituted a committee for judging the teaching capacity of the Marathi-medium teachers. However, none of the members of the committee was acquainted with Marathi. Even the President of the Board of Practical Lessons in Marathi medium could not talk Marathi. Needless to say that in such a state of affairs, the Marathi-speaking students' education suffers. It has also been complained that there have been attempts to abolish the Marathi-medium sections in schools and to diminish the strength of Marathi-medium teachers. The charts, maps and forms etc. supplied by the Government to the Marathi schools are in Kannad and therefore of no use. The text books for Marathi schools do not become available at the time the schools open, but are issued over a period of four months or more with the result that the teachers find it difficult to complete the syllabus. Due to the neglect of Marathi schools, many guardians are sending their wards to the schools in Maharashtra or at Hyderabad. These difficulties have been explained in detail in the representation addressed to the Joint Director of Public Instructions, Government of Mysore, in July 1961 by some prominent persons of this area. The difficulties in dealing with Government offices and officers are similar to those mentioned elsewhere in this memorandum which are experienced by the Marathi-speaking people in the other border areas (Appendix V).

People's Wishes

6.146. (i) The people of this area have expressed their desire for merger in Maharashtra consistently for the last 10 years. In the General Elections held in 1957, Bhalki was a double-member constituency in which the Samyukt Maharashtra Samiti had put up two candidates both of whom won by a large majority. In Hulsur constituency, the Samiti candidate won by a majority of 4,600 votes against the President of the District Congress Committee, who was a candidate of the Joint Front of the Congress and the Karnatak Ekikaran Samiti. It is noteworthy that these elections were fought on the language issue. With fresh delimitation of

constituencies and transformation of the Santpur constituency into a 'reserved constituency', the Samiti could win only the seat from Hulsur in 1962 and narrowly lost the seats from Bhalki and Santpur.

(ii) In the year 1959 Village Panchayat elections were held in Bidar district. These elections were also fought on the issue of the merger of the Marathi-majority areas in the then Bombay State. The Samiti won a majority in 42 out of 64 Village Panchayats of Bhalki taluka. In these elections the Samiti candidates were opposed by the united front of the Congress, the P. S. P. and the Karnatak Ekikaran Samiti.

(iii) Again, in the year 1960 Taluka Board Elections were held in Bidar district. In these elections also, the merger issue was to the fore. In Bhalki taluka the S. M. S. won 11 seats out of 19 and in Santpur taluka it won 11 seats out of 15.

(iv) The people from this area have expressed their keen desire to get the area included in Maharashtra by various methods such as meetings, demonstrations, passing resolutions and even by resorting to 'Satyagraha' and no-tax campaign.

Mysore's Contentions

6.147. In part III of their "Views" on the Border Disputes, where the Government of Mysore have dealt with this area, they have made the following points :—

(i) The four talukas claimed by the Bombay State have an overwhelming majority of Kannad population as compared with any other linguistic group in each of the talukas. In Humnabad taluka Marathi-speaking population is 17 per cent and Kannad 48 per cent; in Bhalki taluka it is 37 per cent and Kannad 48 per cent; in Santpur taluka it is 38 per cent and Kannad 41 per cent; and in Aland taluka it is 9 per cent and Kannad 73 per cent.

(ii) The resolution passed by the Bidar District Congress Committee on 30th March 1956 clearly indicates that the Committee had unanimously requested the Government of Hyderabad to recommend the inclusion of the three talukas of Bhalki, Humnabad and Santpur-Aurad in the Mysore State and retain

Bidar as a district, if necessary by inclusion of certain adjoining areas from the Gulbarga district.

(iii) The Hyderabad Legislative Assembly, when it discussed the States Reorganisation Bill, unanimously agreed to the inclusion of these talukas in the Mysore State.

(iv) There was an agreement among the Legislators (of the former Hyderabad State) prior to the States Reorganisation as regards the areas of the Hyderabad State to be included in the different linguistic States. This view is supported by the speeches of the Members in the Lok Sabha and the letter dated 3rd May 1956, addressed by the then Chief Minister of Hyderabad State, Shri B. Ramkrishna Rao, to the then Home Minister of the Government of India.

(v) There were discussions in the Lok Sabha for the inclusion of these Hyderabad areas in the Maharashtra State. Amendments were moved to the States Reorganisation Bill for inclusion of "contiguous Marathi-speaking areas of Aland taluka" in the Bombay State. There was also an amendment for including in the Bombay State certain other areas in Bhalki, Santpur and Humnabad talukas. These amendments were negatived by the whole House summarily. It would be seen that whenever claims were made in the "constitutional bodies", the respective bodies responsible for the ultimate decisions have invariably rejected the claims for the inclusion of these areas in the Marathi-speaking districts.

(vi) The jurisdiction of the Karnatak Parishad which was formed during the Nizam's rule when political organisations were not allowed to function, comprised the whole of the districts of Bidar, Raichur and Gulbarga. When subsequently political parties began to function, Bidar, Raichur and Gulbarga were also treated as part of the Karnatak area.

Replies to Mysore's arguments

6.148. So far as point (i) above is concerned, it is not correct to say that the Bombay State claimed the four talukas of Humnabad, Bhalki, Santpur and Aland. It claimed only those parts of these talukas, which are predominantly Marathi-speaking. Consequently, the percentages of Marathi and Kannad population for

the *whole talukas* are not relevant to the issue. In the areas of these talukas claimed by the former Bombay (Maharashtra) State, the percentages of Marathi, Kannad and other population are as follows:—

Taluka	Percentage of speakers in areas claimed		
	Marathi	Kannad	Others
Humnabad	63	16	21
Bhalki	59	30	11
Santpur	60	26	14
Aland	68	24	8

It will thus be seen that in the areas claimed by Maharashtra, the Marathi-speaking population has an overwhelming majority over the Kannad-speaking population.

6.149. The next point relates to the resolution of the Bidar district Congress Committee, dated 30th March 1956. That resolution was as follows :—

“The meeting of the District Congress Committee, Bidar, held on 30th March 1956, after fully discussing the situation arising out of the States Re-organisation Draft Bill regarding the *disintegration of the Bidar district and the merger of four talukas of Bidar, Bhalki, Humnabad and Santpur-Aurad in Gulbarga district* feels that this merger has resulted in not only disintegration of Bidar district, but also abolition of the District Headquarters, which creates many difficulties and problems of unemployment and hardships to thousands of people. Taking into consideration all the facts and difficulties, the District Congress Committee fully endorses and supports the memorandum, a copy of which is enclosed herewith, submitted to the Chief Minister, Government of Hyderabad, on behalf of all the Members of the Legislative Assembly and Members of Parliament of Bidar district and some Legislative Members of Gulbarga and Raichur. This meeting further wants to make it clear that due to this injustice great unrest and dissatisfaction is prevailing among the people of Bidar district. Therefore, the District Congress Committee requests the Government of Hyderabad to move in the matter immediately before the Bill is introduced in Lok Sabha and

recommend to the Government of India to retain Bidar district with the inclusion of the necessary adjacent area of Gulbarga as mentioned in the memorandum and assures the Government that it will not have any adverse effect on Gulbarga district." (Italics ours.)

It is clear from the words in italics of this resolution that it concerned itself with the then threatened disintegration of Bidar district and that its purpose was to recommend to the Government of India to retain Bidar as a district with the inclusion of the necessary adjacent area of Gulbarga. There is no mention in this resolution on the question whether the three talukas of Bhalki, Humnabad and Santpur should be retained as they were or whether its Marathi-majority areas should be separated and included in the proposed Bombay State. Apparently, this point was not considered at all. The Government of Mysore are reading into the resolution more than what has been stated. As far as can be seen, that point was not under consideration at all.

6.150. As regards Point (v) about the amendments moved in the Lok Sabha for inclusion of these areas in the Bombay State, it has already been explained in paragraphs 4.3 and 4.7 that the amendments relating to adjustment of boundaries between the States were rejected by the Lok Sabha not on their merits but because it was considered that the Lok Sabha was not the proper forum to go into these matters of detail. Consequently, such matters were left over for consideration by the Zonal Councils, for which a specific provision was made in the States Reorganisation Act.

6.151. Point (vi) regarding the jurisdiction of the Karnatak Parishad has no relevance in the present context. First the boundaries of the jurisdiction of political bodies are drawn purely for party purposes and have no relevance for day to day life of the people as is the case with the boundaries of administrative units. Secondly, if the boundaries of the Mysore State were to be co-terminus with the jurisdiction of the Karnatak Parishad, then the *whole* districts of Raichur, Gulbarga and Bidar should have been included in the Mysore State which did not happen. It is, therefore, incorrect

to urge that because the whole of the districts of Bidar, Raichur and Gulbarga were included within the jurisdiction of the Karnatak Parishad the Mārathi-majority villages in the talukas of Bhalki, Santpur and Humnabad should not be included in Maharashtra.

6.152. Points (iii) and (iv) may be taken together. The Government of Mysore and its representatives on the Four-Man Committee have argued at considerable length that all the members of the former Hyderabad Legislative Assembly and especially the members from Marathwada had agreed to the inclusion of the (whole) talukas of Bhalki, Humnabad and Santpur in the Mysore State and that as this border was settled by mutual agreement among the three linguistic groups in the Hyderabad Legislative Assembly no change should now be made. In fact, amendments had been moved in the Hyderabad Assembly for transfer of parts of Bhalki and Santpur talukas to Bombay State. However, these amendments were not pressed, (i) because there was no agreement between the M. L. A.s from Karnatak and Marathwada regarding the proposed transfers and (ii) because an amendment to the States Reorganisation Bill for appointment of a Boundary Commission was accepted by the Chief Minister Shri B. Ramkrishna Rao as section 114-A of the States Reorganisation Bill and unanimously approved by the three linguistic groups. The evidence to support their contentions is mentioned in the following paragraphs :—

(a) During the general discussion on the States Reorganisation Bill in the Hyderabad Assembly, this is what some of the members said in their speeches:—

(i) Shri Rukhmaji Dhondiba Patil :

“ इस हैदराबाद स्टेट के उदगीर, निलंगा और अहमदपुर इन इलाकों को महाराष्ट्र के साथ मिला दिया गया है इसके लिये मुझे खुशी है, लेकिन इनके साथ साथ भालकी, संतपूर जैसे और दूसरे मुकामात हैं जहां के लोग महाराष्ट्र में जाना चाहते हैं और जहां की पाप्युलेशन महाराष्ट्रीयन है उनको छोड़ दिया गया बड़े अफसोस की बात है।

भालकी, संतपूर यह मराठी बोलनेवाले इलाखे हैं जिन्हें महाराष्ट्र में डाला जाना चाहिये। आज उन्हें कर्नाटक में डाला गया है। इस बिल में बिदर को तोड़ने की जो सिफारिश की गई है और बिदर जो आजतक डिस्ट्रिक्ट का मुकाम था उसे खतम किया जा रहा है। मैं समझता हूँ कि

यह बात नामुनासिब है। बिदर का ऐतिहासिक महत्त्व है। बिदर डिस्ट्रिक्ट तोड़कर आज बिदरवालोंपर अन्याय किया जा रहा है ऐसा मेरा ख्याल है। चीफ मिनिस्टर साब के सामने उन लोगों ने जो मांग पेश की है, उसमें मैं भी उनके साथ हूँ। इसका इस तरह से कुछ इतेजाम किया जाना चाहिये की वहा डिस्ट्रिक्ट का सदर मुकाम कायम रहे।”

(ii) Shri Govindrao More :

“हम एक विलेज को यूनिट बनाने के लिये तैयार हैं। लेकिन चंद बातें ऐसी ऐसी कही जाती हैं कि विलेज को युनिट मानने से हम को तकलीफ होगी। मैं कहता हूँ कि वह तकलीफ हमको चार पांच साल तक होगी। और इस पंचवार्षिक योजना में वहा कुछ नहीं कर सकते तो अगली पंचवार्षिक योजना में करेंगे। लेकिन छोटे से छोटा भाग भी अगर दूसरी भाषा के प्रांत में रहता तो उसको वहासे निकाल कर उसको अपनी भाषा के प्रांत में डालने की हमको कोशिश करनी चाहिए। किनवट और राजुरा के मुतालिक हमारे दिल में खयाल आता है। जब वह महाराष्ट्र का इलाका है तो उसको महाराष्ट्र में मिला देना चाहिये और वहा के लोगों के साथ इन्साफ किया जाना चाहिए। हम जानते हैं कि जिनका जो हिस्सा हो वह उनको दिया जाना चाहिए। हमको अपना हिस्सा दीजिए। कर्नाटक का कर्नाटक को जाना चाहिए। महाराष्ट्र का महाराष्ट्र को जाना चाहिये। और आंध्र का आंध्र को जाना चाहिये।”

(iii) Shri B. D. Deshmukh :

“इस बिल में बाऊंडरीज के बारे में सुझाव है। लेकिन उसके बारे में क्लोज नहीं है। महाराष्ट्र, आंध्र और कर्नाटक के सिलसिले में यह बाऊंडरी का प्रश्न बहुत बड़े प्रमाण में निर्माण होता है। यह जिम्मेदारी मैं समझता हूँ कि एस्. आर्. सी. बिल एक बाऊंडरी कमिशन पर डालना चाहता है लेकिन उसके लिये एक क्लोज इस बिल में होना जरूरी था।”

“आदिलाबाद के राजुरा और किनवट ये मराठी भाषिक भाग हैं वे महाराष्ट्र में मिला दिये जाने चाहिये। मुधोल और देगलूर सर्कल्स के बारे में यही न्याय होना चाहिये। मैं यह कहूंगा कि महाराष्ट्र का कोई भी मेंबर यह नहीं चाहता कि किसी भी प्रांत का कोई हिस्सा जो मराठी भाषा का नहीं है वह हमारे प्रांत में आये। बॉर्डर अँडजेस्टमेंट के लिये जो सबके लिये मंजूर हो सकता है उसकी बुनियाद विलेज युनिट ही हो सकती है। और हमने अपने मेमोरेण्डम में भी इसकी मांग की है। हम चाहते हैं कि विलेज यूनिट पर प्रांतों को तकसीम करने में कोई दिक्कत नहीं है।”

(iv) Shri Madhavrao Ghonsikar :

“आदिलाबाद के अंदर दो तीन तालुके मराठी भाषिक भाषा एक होने के बावजूद उनको आंध्र तेलंगा में शामिल किया गया है और इसी तरह से भालकी और संतपूर को कर्नाटक में शामिल किया गया है। संतपूर तालुके में ७० फीसद से ज्यादा मराठी बोलनेवाले ५८ मवाजियात है और भालकी के अंदर ६० फीसद से ज्यादा मराठी बोलनेवाले लोग ७० मवाजियात में है लेकिन उसके बावजूद उनको कर्नाटक में डाला गया है। कहा जाता है कि जहाँ की भाषा बोलनेवाले की आबादी ७० फीसद से ज्यादा हो उसको उनकी भाषा के प्रांत में डाला जायेगा। ऐसा ही बीदर तालुके के भालकी और संतपूर में ७० फीसद से ज्यादा कानडी भाषा बोलनेवाले लोग किसी भी मौजे में नहीं है इसके बावजूद उनको कर्नाटक में डाला जाता है। इसका मतलब यह है कि यहा सत्तर फीसद का असूल गलत हो जाता है। पहले एस.आर.सी. रिपोर्ट में जिले को युनिट माना गया और आज तालुके को युनिट माना जायगा ऐसा कहा जा रहा है। लेकिन कही पर भी एक तत्व को अमल में नहीं लाया जा रहा है ऐसा उनका मन चाहे किया जा रहा है। त्रावनकोर कोचीन में तो गिरदावर सर्कल तक पहुँच गये है। और बम्बई के आसपास के मवाजियात को ग्रेटर बम्बई में शामिल किया जाता है। अगर तालुका ही एक युनिट माना जा रहा है तो फिर विलेज युनिट कि हद तक नीचे उतर कर बृहन्बम्बई में उनको क्यों शामिल किया जा रहा है और उसको केंद्र शासित रखा जा रहा है? इसलिये मैं कहूंगा कि गिरदावर सर्कल को जहां सुविधा हो माना जाना चाहिये। भालकी तालुके में भालकी गिरदावर सर्कल है। उसमें जो हुरसूल गिरदावर सर्कल है उनको महाराष्ट्र में शामिल कर देना चाहिये इसी तरह से तोरना और औराद के गिरदावर सर्कल्स को महाराष्ट्र में शामिल करना चाहिये।”

(v) Shri Venkatrao Jadhav :

“Aside the Bombay question I have to submit that a task was assigned to Shri Misra, the Hyderabad Chief Justice. He decided village as the basis and gave an award ceding Bellary to the Mysore State. The Government of India did not accept the recommendations of the State Reorganisation Committee, but they accepted the award given by Shri Misra. In as much as Shri Misra had declared village as the basis and this was accepted, the Government of India ought to have decided the question of Rajura-Manikgarh, Bhalki, Santpur on the same basis. But it was not decided so. The

Government of India has at least accepted the principle suggested by Shri Misra. But it was not made applicable to the areas mentioned above."

(vi) Shri Virendra Patil :

"अब आखीर में मैं बॉर्डर्स के तालुक से कुछ अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ। यहाँ बहुत सारे मेंबर्स ने अपना यह खयाल जाहिर किया कि विलेज युनिट मानकर बॉर्डर का तसफिया किया जाना चाहिये। और सबसे गव्हर्नमेन्टपर यह बात नहीं छोडनी चाहिये। मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे महाराष्ट्र के जो हिस्से हैं वह हम अपने पास नहीं रखना चाहते उसी तरह से तेलगू का भी कुछ एरिया यदी हमारे पास आया है तो उसे भी हम अपने पास रखना नहीं चाहते। मराठवाडे का हिस्सा मराठवाडे को मिलना चाहिये। इसी तरह तेलंगाने का हिस्सा तेलंगाने को मिलना चाहिये। इसी तरह से सोलापूर और अक्कलकोट जो महाराष्ट्र में रखे गये हैं वह कर्नाटक में जाने चाहिये। इन तमाम के बारे में आसानी से तसफिया किया जा सकता है। मराठवाडे के हमारे पास, भालकी और संतपूर हिस्से हैं उसी तरहसे सोलापूर और अक्कलकोट के कुछ हिस्से हैं जो म्हैसूर स्टेट में आने चाहिये। उन तमाम के बारे में नये स्टेट वजूद में आने के बाद आसानी से तसफिया किया जा सकता है ऐसा मेरा ख्याल है। हम सब मिलकर बाद में उसके बारे में सोच सकते हैं।"

"यहाँ पर जो बीदर के लोग हैं उनका यह ख्याल है कि यह कदम ठीक न होगा बल्कि बीदर जिले को कायम रखा जाना चाहिये। मैं भी इस बात को मानता हूँ कि बीदर को अलग रखा जाना चाहिये और उनको जो जिले की हैसियत है वह कायम रखी जानी चाहिये।"

(vii) Shri L. K. Shroff :

"Then, the question of boundaries or adjustment of boundaries also cropped up very prominently here and many Hon. Members said that Telugu area has got to receive so many parts from Karnataka, Maharashtrians should get back so much area from Karnataka and so on and so forth. Well, there are claims and counter-claims on both sides and we have to accept what is now given in the Bill. We have to be satisfied with them and *later on*, as there is a provision in the Bill itself, *boundary adjustments should certainly be made by mutual agreement or by appointing a Boundary Commission*, as has been hinted at in the Introduction to the Bill itself."

“ My suggestion is that this district of Bidar, even though there are four talukas, should be kept separate as a district and, if necessary, certain adjoining areas of Gulbarga district should be added to that district and the integrity of the district be continued because we have, all along, been continuing to think that Karnatak area of this State means the three districts of Raichur, Gulbarga and Bidar and for us to think that it consists of only two districts will not be a happy thing. Besides, the interests of the people of Bidar district do demand that a separate district should be maintained for them.”

It will be clear from these speeches that the members of the Hyderabad Assembly desired (i) that Bidar should be retained as a district, (ii) that parts of the talukas of Bhalki and Santpur having a majority of Marathi-speaking people should go to Maharashtra and the same principle should be followed in respect of Telugu and Kannad majority areas, (iii) that the village or circle should be taken as the unit for these transfers, and (iv) that a Boundary Commission should be appointed after the States were formed for actual demarcation of the areas to be transferred, if there in no mutual agreement.

(b) To give a concrete shape to these suggestions, amendments were moved to the States Reorganisation Bill in the Hyderabad Assembly when the clause by clause discussion was taken up. The following amendments are relevant:—

(i) *The Chief Minister (Shri B. Ramkrishna Rao)*.—“ II(b) In Clause 7, in paragraph (c) of sub-clause (1), for the words “Bidar, Bhalki, Humnabad and Santpur (Aurad) talukas of Bidar district”, the words “ Bidar district, excluding Ahmadpur, Nilanga, Udgir, Narayankhed and Zahirabad taluqas” shall be substituted.

(c) In Clause 7, sub-clause (2), the words and brackets “The said taluqas of Bidar, Bhalki, Humnabad and Santpur (Aurad) shall be included in, and become part of, Gulbarga district” shall be omitted.”

(ii) *Shri Annarao Gurumukhi*.—“ That in the Resolution to Clause (3) of the Bill, as amendment II(B), add the following in the end :—

“ If the areas of four talukas be considered insufficient, the minimum necessary areas from Gulbarga district, may be added to it by the successor State.”

(iii) *Shri B. D. Deshmukh*.—“ That in line 3 of sub-clause (1)(c) for “Bhalki, Humnabad and Santpur (Aurad)” substitute “ Bhalki (except Hulsur revenue circle), Humnabad and Santpur (Aurad) (except Torna revenue circle) ”.”

(iv) *Shri Annajirao Gavane*.—“ In line 3 of sub-clause (1)(c) between “ Bhalki ” and “ Humnabad ” insert “ except Bhalki and Hulsur revenue circles ”.

“ (3) (39) in sub-clause (1)(b)—

(a) In line 2 between “ Talukas ” and “ of ” insert “ and revenue circles of Ladwanti taluka, Bhalki and Hulsur of Bhalki taluka, Aurad and Torna of Santpur taluka ”.

(v) *Shri K. Ramchandra Reddy*.—“ After clause 14, add a new clause 14-A :—

“ 14-A. The President of India shall appoint before the appointed day Commission or Commissions to adjust the boundaries of the State formed by the provisions of this part, as far as possible on the basis of contiguous villages of one language being included in the territory of the same language.”

(vi) *Shri Udhaorao Patil*.—“ After the clause, add a new clause 14-A :—

“ 14-A. The Central Government shall appoint a Boundary Commission to settle the boundaries of the State to be formed on the basis of contiguous village unit having 55 per cent of linguistic population.”

Mr. SPEAKER : “ Amendment moved ”.

श्री. उद्धवराव पाटील : यह जो १४(ए) ऐसा छप गया है वह ११४(ए) ऐसा होना चाहिये । ऐसा मालूम होता है कि टाईप के कुछ गलती हो गई है । मेरी जो अमेंडमेंट है वह क्लॉज ११४ में और ११४(ए) बढ़ाने के लिये दी गयी है ।

(3) (i) The Government of India had, however, indicated that only those amendments would be considered by them which were passed unanimously by a State Assembly. Naturally, the Hyderabad Assembly passed only those amendments which could be passed unanimously. Regarding the remaining amendments about which there was no unanimity it was decided that the border adjustments proposed in those amendments should be considered by a Boundary Commission. This is clear from the following extract from Shri B. Ramkrishna Rao's speech in the Hyderabad Assembly on 12th April 1956 :—

“ Most of the Honourable Members of this House from both the sides have agreed that as far as we can arrive at unanimous decisions with regard to internal adjustment of boundaries, we may adopt them at this stage and *for the disputed areas we may take some time and entrust the matter to the Boundary Commission....*”

(ii) Among the “ Disputed areas ” *i.e.* those regarding which a unanimous decision could not be arrived at, were parts of Marathwada in Bhalki, Humnabad and Santpur talukas. The amendments seeking transfer of these areas were left for consideration by a Boundary Commission. This is clear from the following extracts from Shri B. Ramkrishna Rao's speech :—

(a) “ These amendments seek to transfer some areas from Marathwada to Karnatak and *vice-versa*. Such matter should be left to Boundary Commission. Bidar is going to be split into three parts. *Most of the members are of the opinion that all the four talukas of Bidar, Bhalki, Humnabad and Santpur (Aurad) should not be included in Karnataka. I have also received some Resolutions in this respect but I don't like to go into their details. Such miscellaneous matters should not be called in question at this stage.*”

(b) “ This pertains to Ladvali (Ladwanti) and Humnabad which I have spoken of before and don't want to repeat *being matters to be decided by the Boundary Commission.*”

(iii) The amendment proposing the establishment of a Boundary Commission as moved by Shri Udhaorao Patil was accepted by

Shri B. Ramkrishna Rao with some verbal alterations. This is what the latter said:

“ I have accepted with some verbal amendments the proposal of the Boundary Commission which is moved by the Hon. Member Shri Udhaorao Patil. The explanatory note also attached to this Bill has provided definitely for the appointment of a Boundary Commission. Under the circumstances the disputed matters or *cases dealing with units lower than the revenue circles should be left to the Boundary Commission.*”

Shri B. Ramkrishna Rao moved an amendment to the amendment of Shri Udhaorao Patil regarding establishment of a Boundary Commission, as follows :—

‘(1) In the first line substitute the word “ Union ” for the word “ Central ” and substitute the word “ may ” for the word “ shall ”.

‘(2) In line (3) delete the words from “ on the basis ” to the word “ population ” in line (4).’

‘(3) After the word, “ formed ” in line (3) add the words “ in a satisfactory manner ”.’

With these changes, the amendment for establishing a Boundary Commission emerged as follows :—

“ The Union Government may appoint a boundary Commission to settle the boundaries of the State to be formed in a satisfactory manner.”

(iv) In view of this amendment moved by the Chief Minister himself, the movers of the amendments regarding transfer of various areas withdrew their amendments (*vide* p. 2161 of Hyderabad Legislative Assembly Debates). These proceedings clearly show that so far as the Hyderabad State Assembly was concerned, it was *not agreed* that the *whole* talukas of Bhalki, Humnabad and Santpur should *permanently* remain in Mysore State. As the adjustment of the boundary in these talukas was to be made by taking a unit lower than a revenue circle, the matter was left to be considered by a Boundary Commission.

(4) The suggestion regarding establishment of a Boundary Commission did not find favour with the Government of India. The Union Home Minister stated in his speech in the Lok Sabha

on 31st July 1956 that he was not enamoured of the idea. He pointed out that the scope of the Zonal Councils had been enlarged and two things which had been specifically mentioned for the consideration of the Zonal Councils were boundary disputes and safeguards for linguistic minorities. So, he hoped that when the new States were formed, the boundary disputes would be settled by them through the agency of the Zonal Councils.

(5) (i) Shri B. Ramkrishna Rao's letter of 3rd May 1956 addressed to the Union Home Minister has been relied on by the Government of Mysore and its Representatives on the Four-Man Committee for showing that there was an agreement among the Legislators about the areas of Hyderabad State to be included in the three States of Andhra, Bombay and Mysore. That letter is reproduced in Appendix VII. It will be seen that it was written for a limited purpose. As the opening paragraph of the letter shows, it was written "to stress particularly the amendments suggested (to the States Re-organisation Bill by the Hyderabad Assembly) regarding territorial adjustments and regarding Bidar district" in order that they may be given due consideration by the Select Committee (of the Lok Sabha for the States Re-organisation Bill).

(ii) Paragraph 2 of the letter refers to Bidar district. It is stated—

(a) that it was the unanimous desire of the Kannadigas and others of the State that Bidar district should be retained as a separate unit ;

(b) that if the four talukas (of Bidar, Bhalki, Humnabad and Santpur) were considered insufficient to constitute a district, necessary area from the adjoining areas of Gulbarga may subsequently be added by the successor Government ;

(c) that Shri B. Ramkrishna Rao had a talk regarding the matter with Shri Hanumanthaiya and the latter had agreed that Bidar may be retained as a separate district. Shri Hanumanthaiya was going to write to the Union Home Minister about it ; and

(d) as this was an important deviation from the original Bill, Shri Rao hoped that the Union Home Minister and the

Select Committee would kindly accept it as it was based on the unanimous opinion of the people concerned.

So, the purpose of writing this was to make the Union Home Minister and the Select Committee accept the Hyderabad Assembly's recommendation in respect of Bidar district, although it was an important deviation from the original Bill. It was not only necessary for the Chief Minister for this purpose to mention in this letter that certain amendments had been moved for transfer of some parts of the four talukas of Bidar district to Maharashtra and that they were withdrawn as a result of the proposed amendment for establishment of a Boundary Commission, but to do so would have been positively harmful to his cause. There were already misgivings as to whether four talukas would be considered sufficient to constitute a district [*vide (b) above*]. If it had been mentioned that there were demands for transfer of portions of those talukas to another State, the case for constituting the four talukas into a separate district would have been further weakened. It was, therefore, prudent on the part of the Chief Minister of Hyderabad not to mention those demands in that letter. But the absence of such a mention cannot be construed, in the face of the proceedings of the Hyderabad Legislative Assembly, to mean, as has been done by the Mysore Representatives in their report, that there were no such demands or that the demands were withdrawn in the larger interest of retaining of Bidar as a district. The extracts from speeches quoted above show that the persons who demanded the transfer of some areas Bhalki, Humnabad and Santpur to Maharashtra were also among the persons who supported the demand for continuing Bidar as a district. These two things were not to their mind mutually exclusive.

(iii) Having dealt with the question of Bidar district in paragraph 2 of his letter, Shri Ramkrishna Rao proceeded in paragraphs 3 and 4 to deal with "the other territorial adjustments" which had been "suggested unanimously by the Assembly in view of the fact that the people of those areas would have otherwise had to face practical difficulties". These "other territorial adjustments" comprised (i) transfer of Kinwat and Rajura talukas of Adilabad district to Marathwada, (ii) transfer of Nyalkal Circle of Bidar Tahsil to

Andhra, (iii) transfer of Nirna Circle from Andhra to Mysore. It was stated that “the representatives of all the three regions in the Assembly came to the unanimous conclusion that even if those areas are lesser than a tahsil or a taluka they should be added on to the respective linguistic groups”. These agreements were unanimously arrived at by the three linguistic groups.

(iv) These agreements were not the only ones. There was a proposal, as stated in paragraph 5 of Shri Ramkrishna Rao's letter, for the transfer of 19 or 20 villages of Rajolibanda area in Raichur district. There was an agreement regarding it but as the area concerned was less than a Revenue Circle, Shri Rao said, “We did not include it as an item for amendment. I am trying to get an agreement with Shri..... and the local people and we will put before you a joint proposal regarding that area”. Thus all the amendments that were proposed were on the basis of agreement. It is clear from Shri Ramkrishna Rao's and Shri Virendra Patil's speeches as quoted above and Shri Devising Chauhan's speech in the Bombay Legislative Assembly on 11th March 1960 that there was no agreement regarding the transfer of areas of Bhalki, Humnabad and Santpur talukas to Maharashtra and that the question was left to be settled by constituting a Boundary Commission after the new States were formed. Shri Devising Chauhan said in his speech :

“The territories of Rajura, Kinwat, Islapur and parts of Deglur and Bhiansa talukas of Nanded district were exchanged by us on the basis of population and area. In the same manner we tried to solve the question of the territories on the boundary on the side of Karnatak by discussion and agreement with the leaders of Karnatak but we were not successful. We held discussions in this matter with the then Minister Shri Annarao Gurumukhi, Shri Chandrasekhar Patil and Shri Virendra Patil but they did not co-operate with us in solving this problem by agreement. On the contrary, they told us that so long as we were not prepared to discuss the question of Akkalkot and parts of Sholapur or some other parts, they were unable to discuss this question. In view of the attitude adopted by them, we could not solve this problem then. I am saying this only for

the reason that it has been stated on behalf of Mysore that this question has been settled mutually and should not be reopened. This is not correct. I wanted specially to bring this to the notice of the House.”

It is thus clear that the question of Maharashtra's border with Mysore in the Marathwada areas was not finally settled, and it was hoped that the question of boundary adjustment would be settled by the Boundary Commission.

(6) It may be noted that Shri B. Ramkrishna Rao has stated in paragraph 3 of his very letter of 3rd May 1956 as follows :—

“ Small linguistic border areas are a source of trouble even for the administration and, as far as possible, they should be merged with the bigger linguistic groups ”.

Linguistic States having been formed and the question of adjustment of boundaries having been left over, it is imperative that the small linguistic border areas mentioned by Shri Ramkrishna Rao should be merged with appropriate linguistic group so as to avoid ‘trouble’ and to have maximum administrative convenience. In fact the Government of Maharashtra have been urging this very point for the last ten years.

6.153. The fact that there was no agreement regarding the inclusion of the whole talukas of Bhalki, Santpur and Humnabad in the Mysore State is also borne out by the memorandum submitted to the Chairman of the Select Committee on the States Reorganisation Bill by members of the Marathwada Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti which included two M.Ps.

Arguments of Mysore's representatives on Four-Man Committee

6.154. In Chapter XXVI of their report, the representatives of the Government of Mysore on the Four-man Committee have made some further points. They are as follows:—

(i) This area was under the jurisdiction of Kannada Rulers for centuries.

(ii) The Census of 1951 discloses that the Kannada population of Kalyan (Kalyani) is hardly 26 per cent while the percentage

of those other than Kannada and Marathi is 59. This high percentage is of Urdu-speaking people i.e. Muslims. Kalyan (Kalyani) was the fountainhead of Kannada language in the time of Basava and it must then have been a completely Kannad place. This shows that the linguistic composition of any place or area is not stable but is capable of fast changes under the stress of circumstances.

(iii) Kalyan (Kalyani) is the biggest place in Humnabad taluka and commands considerable trade from long distances. Many villages round about, including those claimed as Marathi-villages in this taluka and also those in Bhalki taluka have trade connections with Kalyan where they market their produce. In view of these considerations, linguistic majority and contiguity are not sufficient grounds for disturbing them from their present position in these talukas.

(iv) Most of the villages claimed by Maharashtra have trade relations with Bhalki if not with Kalyan. The people who support the transfer of the Marathi-majority villages to Maharashtra are of the opinion that the villages should be transferred along with the town of Bhalki but not, if the town is not to be transferred. This shows the importance of trade and economic relations of these villages with that town.

(v) Both Aurad as well as Santpur are connected with Bidar. The distance between Bidar and Santpur may be about 45 miles. There is no road connecting Santpur to any other important town in Maharashtra. The distance between these places and the district town in Maharashtra is too great. Administratively it is more convenient that these places should be in Bidar district. These points must have weighed heavily while an agreement was arrived at between the three linguistic groups prior to the reorganisation that these areas should go to Karnatak. Facility of communication was one of the most important considerations which over-weighed the consideration of linguistic homogeneity when 17 villages in Umbargaon taluka were allowed to be transferred to Gujarat at the time of bifurcation of the bilingual Bombay State. The ground of "facility of communication"

thus justifies the retention of the Marathi-speaking villages in the talukas of Bhalki and Santpur.

Replies to Mysore's Representatives' Arguments

6.155. (i) The Government of Maharashtra strongly urge that the boundaries of Maharashtra and Mysore, and for that matter of any other State in India today, cannot be determined on considerations of what dynasty ruled where in historical times because there is no limit how far back in history one can go in such a matter. Even so, it may be pointed out with reference to the Mysore Representatives' contention that the area in question was under the jurisdiction of Kannada rulers, that just before this area passed under the Nizam's sway, it was ruled over by Maratha Chieftains. In the time of Chhatrapati Shivaji Maharaj, Ramchandra Jadhav and Chandrasen Jadhav ruled at Bhalki which was then known as Bhadravati and since then their dynasty ruled there till the Nizam took over. However, the Government of Maharashtra do not wish to press this point.

(ii) It is not clear what the Mysore Government wish to plead when they say that linguistic composition of any area is not stable but is capable of fast changes under the stress of circumstances. For one thing, linguistic composition is not generally capable of 'fast' changes. Secondly, although linguistic composition may change somewhat over a period of years, that cannot be an argument for subjecting a substantial linguistic minority to hardship at the present moment. If that were not so, there would have been no point in re-organising the States of India on linguistic basis. The mutability of linguistic frontiers cannot be a ground for drawing up inter-State boundaries haphazardly.

(iii) Mysore's Representatives have said that the villages in Humnabad and Bhalki talukas claimed by Maharashtra have trade connections with Kalyani in Humnabad taluka where they market their produce. It is not clear why any difficulty should arise in these trade relations even if the villages in question come to be included in Maharashtra. If the villagers find that they can market their produce more easily or profitably at Kalyani than at any other place, they will continue to do so. If, however, they

find that they can send their produce to any other market, they would be equally free to do so. If the villagers had any fear that their trade would suffer as a result of their transfer to Maharashtra, they would not have expressed a keen desire for merger of their villages in Maharashtra. In point of fact, the villagers who should know their interests best have represented to the Government to Maharashtra that the main crops of this area are cotton, groundnuts and jowar and the economic life of the farmer is dependent upon the trade centres of Marathwada such as Udgir, Latur and Nanded. The Villagers are not, therefore, likely to suffer by the proposed transfer.

(iv) Regarding the Mysore Representatives' statement that the people who support the transfer of Marathi-majority villages to Maharashtra are of the opinion that the villages should be transferred only if the town of Bhalki is transferred but not otherwise, it has been stated in the representations received by Maharashtra Government that Bhalki Town consists of two parts shown separately in the "Village-wise Mother Tongue Data" of 1951 as '19-A Bhalki (Urban)' and '19-B Bhalki (Rural)'. The composition of Bhalki (Urban) is Kannad 39 per cent and Marathi 25 per cent whereas that of Bhalki (Rural) is Marathi 75 per cent and Kannad 23 per cent. Bhalki (Rural) consists of about 12 'wadis' around Bhalki. As these 'wadis' have a high percentage of Marathi population, the people feel that these 'wadis' along with Bhalki (Urban) should be transferred to Maharashtra notwithstanding the fact that the latter has a Kannad majority because Bhalki (Urban) is an island among Marathi 'wadis'.

(v) As for Santpur taluka, the Government of Maharashtra are not claiming the town of Santpur. Its distance from Bidar and communications with Bidar have no relevance. As for the villages in Santpur taluka, they are about 70-75 miles from district towns in Maharashtra. Even so, the people are keen on their inclusion in Maharashtra due to the factors mentioned in the preceding paragraphs. It has already been explained that there was no agreement in regard to the inclusion of these areas in Mysore State.

6.156. The people of this area desire that they should be shown the same consideration which was shown to the people of Nirna circle of Zahirabad, Nyalkal circle of Bidar and Jukkal circle of Deglur, Bhiansa and Kuber circles of Mudhol and Islapur circle of Both talukas by transferring them to the State in which their convenience from the point of view of language and culture could be secured. Nirna circle was included in Mysore State, Nyalkal, Bichkonda, Jukkal, Mudhol, Bhiansa and Kuber circles were included in Andhra Pradesh and Islapur circle was included in the Bombay State (Maharashtra). For this reason the people of these villages which in all talukas except Aland form compact blocks as big as a circle, naturally feel that their interests and well-being have been overlooked while reorganising the States.

Kannad Majority Areas in Maharashtra State

6.157. In the Akalkot, South Sholapur and Mangalwedha talukas of the Sholapur district, the Jath taluka of the Sangli district and the Shirol and Gadhinglaj talukas of the Kolhapur district, there are compact areas wherein there is a majority of the Kannad-speaking people over the Marathi-speaking people. The Government of Bombay had proposed that the demarcation of the boundary between the Bombay and Mysore States in these areas should also be reviewed and readjusted so as to transfer to the Mysore State contiguous Kannad-speaking areas. The Government of Maharashtra would have no objection to the boundary being readjusted in these areas on the principles propounded by them in this memorandum provided those principles are equally applied in readjusting the boundary in the areas claimed by the Government of Maharashtra.



APPENDIX I

Six Maps in a separate folder

MAP No. 1—Contiguity of the border areas with neighbouring talukas.

MAP No. 2—Physical features of the disputed areas.

MAP No. 3—Border areas *vis-a-vis* extent of the two States.

MAP No. 4—Belgaum City and surrounding areas—Physical features.

MAP No. 5—14 Taluka Maps—Akalkot, Athni, Belgaum, Chikodi, Gadhinglaj, Haliyal, Hukeri, Jath, Karwar, Khanapur, Mangalwedha, Shirol, South Sholapur and Supa.

MAP No. 6—Areas of submergence of the Kalinadi Project.

APPENDIX II

(1)

(*Vide* paragraphs 2.1 and 4.8)

No. F. 38/13/66-SR

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

Ministry of Home Affairs

New Delhi-11, the 25th October 1966

RESOLUTION

Taking into consideration the fundamental basis of the reorganisation of States in India and with a view to solving the existing border disputes between the States of Maharashtra and Mysore and Mysore and Kerala, the Government of India hereby appoint a Commission consisting of Shri Mehr Chand Mahajan, former Chief Justice of India, which shall hear the concerned parties and make its recommendations.

2. The Commission will be at liberty to devise its own procedure for its work, including collection of information and ascertaining public opinion. The Commission will ordinarily hold its sittings in private.

3. The Commission will have a Secretary and such staff and officers as may be considered necessary.

(Signed) HARI SHARMA,
Secretary to the Government of India.

(2)

*(Vide paragraph 2.1)***PRESS COMMUNIQUE**

Shri Mehr Chand Mahajan has assumed charge of his office and the Commission appointed by the Government of India to inquire into the existing boundary disputes between the States of Maharashtra-Mysore and Mysore-Kerala has started functioning in New Delhi. The Resolution appointing the Commission has left it to the Commission to devise its own procedure for ascertaining public opinion on the problems referred to it. The Commission has decided upon the following procedure:—

State Governments, Members of Parliament and the State Legislatures, individuals, associations, public institutions, etc. who may be interested in the problem should submit written memoranda to the Commission stating their views on the dispute after taking into consideration the fundamental basis of the reorganisation of States in India and their suggestions for resolving it. The memoranda should be fully documented with factual data and information and should be accompanied by a large scale map showing the towns and villages and natural boundaries like rivers, canals, mountains. The areas in dispute should be marked clearly on the map with red chalk and a different colour green or blue used for illustrating their suggestions for a settlement of the dispute. The existing boundaries between Maharashtra and Mysore should be distinctly drawn and as also the boundary as it would be according to their suggested solutions. After examination of these memoranda and after hearing those individuals, associations, etc. who may wish to place their views before the Commission in person, the Commission will visit the States and hold sittings at Poona and Bangalore. These sittings will be private. Accordingly, the Commission has drawn up a tentative programme as follows:—

November 15, 1966	}	Submission of memoranda by State Governments, Members of Parliament and State Legislatures, individuals, associations, public institutions, etc. who may be interested in the problem. Interviews.
to January 15, 1967		
January 16, 1967	}	Examination of the memoranda received by the Commission. Meetings with Ministers from the States who may be in Delhi during this period.
to March 1, 1967.		
March 15, 1967	}	Tour of the States. The Commission will sit for ten days at Poona and Bangalore. Sittings will be private.
to April 10, 1967.		

Note 1.—This programme is in relation to the Maharashtra-Mysore boundary dispute.

Note 2.—Regarding the Mysore-Kerala boundary dispute the Commission has received a communication from the Government of India informing it

that the Members of Parliament from Kerala have requested that the examination of the boundary dispute between Kerala and Mysore should be taken up after a popular Government is installed in Kerala. The Kerala Government have also stated that this is also the feeling of the Malayalam-speaking population in Kerala. In view of this the Commission has acceded to the request. The further programme of the Commission will be announced after the general elections in Kerala.

Note 3.—This programme is tentative subject to adjustments in the light of the views of the State Governments concerned.

In accordance with the procedure outlined above the Commission invites the State Governments, Members of Parliament and State Legislatures, individuals, associations and public institutions who are interested in the problem entrusted to the Commission to submit fully documented memoranda together with supporting maps by January 15, 1967, at the latest. Those individuals and persons who would like to meet the Commission and submit their views in person may also indicate the date on which they would like to meet the Commission. Interviews will be between 10-30 a.m. and 12-30 p.m. on all working days in the Office of the Commission. The memoranda and all communications to the Commission in connection therewith should be addressed to the Secretary to the Commission at the following address:—

The Secretary,
Commission on Maharashtra-Mysore-Kerala
Boundary Disputes,
Room No. 14, L-I Block,
Central Secretariat,
New Delhi-1.

(3)

(*Vide* paragraph 2.13 & 2.27)

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS
RESOLUTION

New Delhi, the 29th December 1953.

No. 53/69/53-Public.—The Government of India have been giving careful consideration to the problem of the States which are constituent units of the Indian Union. These States, as they exist today, are largely the result of historical processes and the spread and consolidation of the British Power in India. On the attainment of Independence, India was partitioned and the independent State of Pakistan was created. A process of merger and integration took place in regard to what were then called the “Indian States”. This

integration of the old Indian States, which was brought about within a very short period, was an event of historic significance. The integration, however, was naturally based to a large extent on the old pattern which existed before Independence.

2. The pattern of States in the Union is thus the result of historical accident and circumstances. Their mere existence for a hundred years or more developed political, administrative and cultural associations within and between them.

3. The greater development of political consciousness among the people and the growing importance of the great regional languages led gradually to demands for the formation of certain States on a linguistic basis. Each such separate problem was however closely inter-related with other problems, and any formation of a new State necessarily affected a number of other States. It thus became increasingly difficult to consider any such problem in isolation.

4. The language and culture of an area have an undoubted importance as they represent a pattern of living which is common in that area. In considering a reorganisation of States, however, there are other important factors which have also to be borne in mind. The first essential consideration is the preservation and strengthening of the unity and security of India. Financial, economic and administrative considerations are almost equally important, not only from the point of view of each State, but for the whole nation. India has embarked upon a great ordered plan for her economic, cultural and moral progress. Changes which interfere with the successful prosecution of such a national plan would be harmful to the national interest.

5. The Government of India have come to the conclusion that the whole question of the reorganisation of the States of the Indian Union should be carefully examined, objectively and dispassionately, so that the welfare of the people of each constituent unit, as well as of the nation as a whole, is promoted. The Government have accordingly decided to appoint a Commission to conduct such an examination.

6. The Commission will consist of Shri Saiyid Fazl Ali, at present Governor of Orissa, Shri Hriday Nath Kunzru, Member of the Council of States, and Shri Kavalam Madhava Panikkar, at present Ambassador of India in Egypt, of whom Shri Saiyid Fazl Ali shall be the Chairman of the Commission.

7. The Commission will investigate the conditions of the problem, the historical background, the existing situation and the bearing of all important and relevant factors thereon. They will be free to consider any proposal relating to such reorganisation. The Government expect that the Commission would, in the first instance, not go into the details, but make recommendations in regard to the broad principles which should govern the solution of this problem and, if they so choose, the broad lines on which particular States should be reorganised, and submit interim reports for the consideration of Government.

8. The Commission will be at liberty to devise their own procedure for their work, for collecting information and for ascertaining public opinion. The Commission will ordinarily hold their sittings in private.

9. The Commission will have a Secretary and such staff and advisers as may be considered necessary.

10. The Commission will make their recommendations to the Government as soon as may be practicable, and not later than the 30th June 1955.

(Signed) A. V. PAI,
Secretary.

(4)

(Vide paragraph 2.19 & 6.2-A)

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

RESOLUTION

New Delhi, the 23rd April 1966/3rd Vaisakha 1888.

No. F. 17/7/66-SR.—The Government of India have decided to reorganise the present State of Punjab on linguistic basis so as to constitute from its territories two States, namely, Punjab and Haryana States, after transferring to Himachal Pradesh such of the hill areas particularly of the Hindi Region of the State as are contiguous to that Union territory and have cultural and linguistic affinities with it. For the purpose of determining the actual boundaries of these units, the Government of India consider it necessary that there should be an examination of the matter by a Commission. They have accordingly decided to appoint a Commission consisting of :

Chairman

1. Shri Justice Jayantilal Chhotalal Shah, Judge of the Supreme Court.

Members

2. Shri S. Dutt.
3. Shri M. M. Philip.

2. The Commission shall examine the existing boundary of the Hindi and Punjabi Regions of the present State of Punjab and recommend what adjustments, if any, are necessary in that boundary to secure the linguistic homogeneity of the proposed Punjab and Haryana States. The Commission shall also indicate the boundaries of the hill areas of the present State of Punjab which are contiguous to Himachal Pradesh and have linguistic and cultural

affinity with that territory. The Commission shall apply the linguistic principle with due regard to the census figures of 1961 and other relevant considerations. The Commission may also take into account such other factors as administrative convenience and economic well being, geographic contiguity and facility of communication and will ordinarily ensure that the adjustments that they may recommend do not involve breaking up of existing tehsils.

3. The Commission will be at liberty to devise its own procedure for its work. The Commission will ordinarily hold its meeting in private.

4. The Commission will make its recommendations to the Government of India not later than the 31st May 1966.

(Signed) L. P. SINGH,
Secretary.

(5)

(Vide paragraph 1.6)

**GOVERNMENT RESOLUTION AS PASSED BY THE BOMBAY
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ON 11th MARCH 1960
(Morning Sitting)**

“WHEREAS the Government of Bombay had on the 25th June 1957 moved the Zonal Council of the Western Zone to consider the readjustment of boundaries between the States of Mysore and Bombay and to advise the Central Government and the Governments of Bombay and Mysore with reference thereto and also submitted a memorandum in this behalf ;

AND WHEREAS no progress has been made in the discussion on the subject before the Zonal Council and the matter has been pending for over 2½ years ;

AND WHEREAS on the enactment of the Bombay State Reorganization Bill, 1960, the Western Zonal Council comprising of the States of Bombay and Mysore will cease to exist ;

AND WHEREAS it is desirable that the boundary adjustments between the States of Bombay and Mysore be effected without any further loss of time ;

This Assembly declares its acceptance of and support to the memorandum submitted by the Government of Bombay to the Zonal Council and strongly urges upon the Central Government to initiate immediate steps and pursue them with a view to arriving at a just and satisfactory settlement of the border

so as to remove a feeling of frustration and despondency in the minds of a large section of the population of the border areas and the State of Bombay and the political uncertainty and tension resulting therefrom."

(6)

**दिनांक ५ एप्रिल १९६६ रोजी महाराष्ट्र विधिमंडळाच्या
दोन्ही सभागृहात पास झालेला ठराव**

म्हैसूर राज्यामध्ये समाविष्ट करण्यात आलेल्या महाराष्ट्राच्या सीमा विभागातील मराठी जनतेने महाराष्ट्रात विलीन होण्यासाठी जो अन्न सत्याग्रह केला त्याची दखल हे सभागृह घेत असून त्यांच्या भावनांशी ते संपूर्णतया सहमत आहे. मराठी भाषिक सीमा विभाग महाराष्ट्र राज्यात विलीन करण्याची मागणी या सभागृहाने या पूर्वीच केली होती. ती मागणी पूर्ण न करता अनिर्णित ठेवणे केवळ महाराष्ट्र राज्याच्याच दृष्टीने नव्हे तर एकंदर राष्ट्राच्या एकात्मतेच्या दृष्टीने अहितकारक ठरेल. तेव्हा हे सभागृह केंद्र सरकारला असे निक्षुन सांगत आहे की सदर सीमा भागातील जनतेने आतापर्यंत व्यक्त केलेले मत लक्षात घेता, येत्या सार्वत्रिक निवडणुकीमध्ये महाराष्ट्र राज्याचे घटक म्हणून त्यांना भाग घेता येईल या दृष्टीने सदर मराठी सीमा विभागाचे महाराष्ट्र राज्यात केंद्र सरकारने शक्य तितक्या लवकर विलीनीकरण करावे.

(6A)

**ENGLISH VERSION OF THE RESOLUTION IN MARATHI AS PASSED
BY BOTH THE HOUSES OF THE MAHARASHTRA STATE
LEGISLATURE**

This House takes note of the hunger strike resorted to by the Marathi-speaking people of the border areas, now included in the Mysore State, for inclusion of these border areas into the Maharashtra State and fully endorses their feelings in this regard. This house had already in the past demanded inclusion of Marathi speaking border areas into this State. Non-fulfilment of that demand and keeping it in the state of indecision will not only be detrimental to the interests of the Maharashtra State but also to the interest of national integrity. This house, therefore, asks the Government of India in no uncertain terms that having regard to the sentiments expressed so far by the people of the said border areas, and also with a view to enabling them to participate in the ensuing general elections as an integral part of the state of Maharashtra, to include the said border areas in this State as early as possible.

APPENDIX III

(1)

(*Vide* paragraph 5.14)

No. S. 28/19535-F.

EDUCATION AND INDUSTRIES DEPARTMENT.

Bombay Castle, 9th July 1948.

From

The Assistant Secretary to the Government of Bombay,
Education and Industries Department.

To

D. M. Kulkarni, Esquire, B.A., LL.B., Advocate, Karwar.

Subject.—Konkani.

Recognition of — as a regional language.

Sir,

With reference to your letter, dated the 7th April 1948, addressed to the Under Secretary to the Government of Bombay, Health and Local Government, on the subject mentioned above, I am directed to state that Government has recognised Kannad as the language of the Karnatak region. Konkani is not an independent language. It is only a dialect of Marathi and mainly it is a spoken language. Obviously, therefore, the main language of the Konkani-speaking people is Marathi.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) V. R. NABAR,

Assistant Secretary to the Government of Bombay,
Education and Industries Department.

(2)

*(Vide paragraph 5.14)**Kanara District :
Official Language of—*

GOVERNMENT OF BOMBAY
POLITICAL AND SERVICES DEPARTMENT
 Resolution No. 2026/46
 Bombay Castle, 1st April 1950.

Letter, dated the 10th May, 1949, from Shri D. N. Kulkarni, B.A., LL.B., Advocate, Karwar.

Government endorsement, Political and Services Department, No. 2026/46/24174-B, dated the 20th June, 1949 to the Collector of Kanara.

Letter No. O/A-2806, dated the 26th September, 1949 from the Collector of Kanara.

Government letter, Political and Services Department, No. 2026/46-B, dated 28th November, 1949 to the Collector of Kanara.

Letter No. O/A-2806, dated the 17th March, 1950 from the Collector of Kanara.

Reference : Government letter, Political and Services Department, No. 2026/46-B, dated the 28th November 1949.

All the talukas in this district except Karwar, Haliyal and the Supa Petha are predominantly Kannada, and Kannada is spoken in these talukas. In Karwar Taluka which borders on the Goa territory, majority of the population viz., about 75 per cent. speak Konkani which is a dialect akin to Marathi. Konkani has, however, no script of its own and the Konkani speaking people use either Kannada or Marathi script. The Marathas in Haliyal Taluka speak slang Marathi and the percentage of this community as well as others speaking Marathi is about 50 per cent. In the case of Supa Petha, the Mahalkary reports that the population therein is predominantly Marathi. The remaining population in these Talukas and Petha is Kannada speaking.

It is clear from this that the Talukas of Karwar and Haliyal and the Supa Petha which form a compact and well-defined tract is a bilingual area where a substantial majority of the population speak either Marathi or a dialect akin to it. I, therefore, recommend that both Marathi and Kannada may be allowed as a regional languages in this tract pending the question of formation of linguistic areas.

It may be mentioned that the taluka of Ankola which is contiguous to Karwar has about 30 per cent. Konkani speaking population. In Bhatkal Petha, the Muslim population is 22.4 per cent. of the total population of the petha and Urdu is on their tongue. But I am not aware of any positive demand from these areas to have either Marathi or Urdu declared as an official language along with Kannada. I do not, therefore, consider it necessary at this stage to propose any change in regard to Ankola Taluka or Bhatkal Petha."

RESOLUTION.—In the circumstances stated by the Collector of Kanara, Government is pleased to accept this recommendation that both Marathi and Kannada should be recognised as the regional languages of the talukas of Karwar and Haliyal and Supa Petha in the Kanara District. In other areas of the Kanara District, Kannada language should continue to be the recognised regional language.

By order of the Governor of Bombay,

(Signed) M. D. BHAT,

Chief Secretary to Government of Bombay,
 Political and Services Department.

(3)

(Vide paragraphs 6.38 & 6.49)

Official Language

GOVERNMENT OF BOMBAY

POLITICAL AND SERVICES DEPARTMENT

Resolution No. 2026/46.

Bombay Castle, 17th May 1950.

RESOLUTION

Government has had under consideration for some time past the question of the recognition of the regional languages of the talukas, mahals and pethas of some of the Districts in the Central and Southern Divisions consequent upon their readjustment as a result of the merger of the former Indian States with this State. The Collectors of the Districts concerned whose reports were called for in this behalf, have indicated that the merger of the Indian States and the consequent redistribution of the Districts and their talukas, mahals and pethas have necessitated the reorientation of the official language in these areas. Government has carefully considered the reports of the Collectors concerned and is pleased to direct that, for the purposes of official business, the language or languages shown against the talukas, mahals or pethas mentioned below should be recognised as the regional language or languages of the respective talukas, mahals and pethas :

District	Taluka, Mahal or Petha	Language
Satara North	.. All areas	.. Marathi.
Satara South	.. Jath	.. Kannada and Marathi.
	.. All other areas	.. Marathi.
Sholapur	.. Akalkot	.. Kannada and Marathi.
	.. South Sholapur	.. Kannada and Marathi.
	.. All other areas except North Sholapur and Mangalwedha.	.. Marathi.
Kolhapur	.. Hatkanangale	.. Kannada and Marathi.
	.. Shirol	.. Kannada and Marathi.
	.. Gadhinglaj	.. Kannada and Marathi.
	.. All other areas	.. Marathi.
Dharwar	.. All areas	.. Kannada.
Belgaum	.. Shahapur	.. Kannada and Marathi.
	.. All other areas	.. Kannada
Bijapur	.. All areas	.. Kannada.

As regards North Sholapur and Mangalwedha Talukas of the Sholapur District, orders will be issued later.

By order of the Governor of Bombay,

(Signed) M. D. BHAT,

Chief Secretary to the Government of Bombay,
Political and Services Department.

(Vide paragraphs 6.38 & 6.85-vii)

LETTER

Subject.—Official Language.

To
The Chief Secretary to Government,
Political and Services Department, Bombay.

No. A.D.M.

Belgaum, 12th September 1950.

Reference.—Government P. and S. D. Express Letter, No. 2026/46/
32547-B, dated 1st August 1950.

The official records are maintained in the below mentioned Talukas and Mahals in the languages shown against them :—

Taluka or Mahal.	Languages in which official record is maintained.
Chikodi	.. English, Marathi and Kannada.
Belgaum	.. English, Marathi and Kannada.
Khanapur	.. English, Marathi and Kannada.
Shahapur	.. Marathi.
Chandgad	.. English and Marathi.

2. Communications from this office are sent in English to the Mamlatdars and Mahalkaris.

(Signed).....
for Collector, Belgaum.

(5)

*(Vide paragraph 6-85-viii)***LETTER**

To

The Chief Secretary to Government,
Political and Services Department, Bombay.

Reference.—Your D. O. No. 2026/46/25438-B, dated 13th June 1950.

No. ADM

Belgaum, 20th July 1950

The information called for is as under :—

Name of Taluka or Mahal.	Approximate total population after merger, i.e. according to new set.	Marathi-speaking population (approximate)	Percentage of Marathi-speaking population to total population.
1	2	3	4
Athni ..	1,63,942	16,835	10
Chikodi ..	2,41,274	1,16,790	48
Hukeri ..	1,47,389	15,362	10
Gokak ..	1,53,403	3,681	2
Belgaum ..	1,32,194	52,880	40
Khanapur ..	79,940	41,288	51
Sampgaon ..	1,37,607	} Marathi speaking population negli- gible. Exact population cannot be ascertained without census.	
Parasgad ..	1,13,000		
Shahapur ..	98,624	Entire population Marathi speaking.	
Chandgad ..	40,451	Do.	
Raibag ..	70,085	Entire population Kannad-speaking.	
Katkol ..	41,328	8,205	19

2. The figures of population and percentage of Marathi-speaking population given above are approximate.

Original Copy signed by the Collector.

(Signed).....
for Collector of Belgaum.

APPENDIX IV

(Vide Paragraphs 6.2, 6.21, 6.54 & 6.87)

Statement showing linguistic composition of villages and towns claimed by the Government of Maharashtra.

(Compiled from the 1951 Census enumeration slips.)

TALUKA BELGAUM

DISTRICT BELGAUM

Location Code No. of the Village or Town	Name of the Village or town	Population	Mother tongue (Absolute Figures)				Mother-tongue (Percentages)				
			Marathi	Kannada	Others	Un-specified	Marathi	Kannada	Others	Un-specified	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
<i>Towns</i>											
17-VI	Belgaum Municipality	83,423	43,279	21,047	19,062	35	51.9	25.2	22.9	..	
17-VII	Shahapur Municipality	17,615	10,687	4,112	2,791	25	60.7	23.3	15.8	0.1	
17-VIII	Belgaum Cantt.	..	16,676	7,267	1,763	7,638	8	43.6	10.6	45.8	..
17-10-I	Angol	..	5,824	2,980	1,667	1,172	5	51.2	28.6	20.1	0.1
17-10-II	Madhavpur	..	4,901	2,548	2,080	251	22	52.0	42.4	5.1	0.5
17-10-III	Yellur	..	5,457	4,754	545	141	17	87.1	10.0	2.6	0.3
17-10-147	Belgaum Suburban Area.	2,505	775	526	1,185	19	30.9	21.0	47.3	0.8	

Villages

1	Vadgaon	..	3,023	2,292	367	363	1	75·8	12·1	12·0	..
2	Halage	..	2,683	1,328	1,246	108	1	49·5	46·5	4·0	..
7	Nilgi	..	1,184	1,101	68	14	1	93·0	5·7	1·2	0·1
8	Kudchi	..	2,548	668	1,869	11	..	26·2	73·4	0·4	..
9	Kanabargi	..	3,580	1,113	2,374	84	9	31·1	66·3	2·3	0·3
10	Kalakhamb	..	1,476	920	516	40	..	62·3	35·0	2·7	..
11	Kangrali Bk.	..	1,611	1,354	252	4	1	84·0	15·6	0·3	0·1
12	Kangrali Kh.	..	1,342	1,206	132	1	3	89·9	9·8	0·1	0·2
13	Goudwad	..	679	599	80	88·2	11·8
16	Marnhol	..	263	261	2	99·2	0·8
18	Honage	..	2,741	1,690	699	352	..	61·7	25·5	12·8	..
19	Bharmyanhatti	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D	..
20	Kednur	..	1,787	768	1,005	12	2	43·0	56·2	0·7	0·1
21	Bamberge	..	883	597	286	67·6	32·4
29	Handignur	..	819	808	11	98·7	1·3
30	Mahalenhatti	..	230	158	71	1	..	68·7	30·9	0·4	..
31	Chalvenhatti	..	453	453	100·0
32	Kurihal Bk.	..	378	372	5	1	..	98·4	1·3	0·3	..
33	Kurihal Kh.	..	87	85	2	97·7	2·3
34	Bodkenhatti	..	482	482	100·0
35	Kattanbhavi	..	461	420	40	..	1	91·1	8·7	..	0·2
36	Kadoli	..	3,619	2,694	762	157	6	74·4	21·1	4·3	0·2
38	Bhandiholi	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D	..
40	Mutage	..	2,424	1,623	715	85	1	67·0	29·5	3·5	..
41	Sambre	..	3,495	2,026	1,272	188	9	58·0	36·4	5·4	0·2
50	Khangaon Kh.	..	785	635	97	53	..	80·9	12·4	6·7	..
53	Chandgad	606	413	185	8	..	68·2	30·5	1·3	..

TALUKA BELGAUM

DISTRICT BELGAUM

Location Code No. of the Village or Town	Name of the Village or Town	Population	Mother Tongue (Absolute Figures)				Mother Tongue (Percentages)				
			Marathi	Kannada	Others	Un- specified	Marathi	Kannada	Others	Un- specified	
			4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
<i>Villages—contd.</i>											
54	Ashte	1,248	742	419	87	...	59.4	33.6	7.0	...	
55	Muchandi	2,048	1,346	658	43	1	65.7	32.1	2.1	0.1	
76	Basarikiatti	947	810	122	10	5	85.5	12.9	1.1	0.5	
96	Uchagaon	3,032	2,365	425	242	78.0	14.0	8.0	
97	Gojage	774	506	262	5	1	65.4	33.9	0.6	0.1	
98	Bekkinkere	1,165	1,118	44	1	2	95.9	3.8	0.1	0.2	
99	Ambewadi	1,697	1,577	120	92.9	7.1	
100	Agasge	1,098	482	614	1	1	43.9	55.9	0.1	0.1	
101	Mannur	1,104	821	274	9	74.4	24.8	0.8	
102	Turmuri	977	901	76	92.2	7.8	
103	Bachi	288	284	4	98.6	1.4	
104	Sulage Uchagaon	1,366	1,358	3	5	99.4	0.2	0.4	
105	Hindalga	3,717	2,139	1,105	473	57.6	29.7	12.7	
106	Kallehol	960	945	8	2	5	98.4	0.8	0.2	0.5	
107	Kudremani	1,323	1,293	26	3	1	97.7	2.0	0.2	0.1	
108	Atiwad	565	533	32	94.3	5.7	
109	Alatge	791	789	2	99.7	0.3	
110	Benakanhalli	1,224	1,062	63	98	1	86.8	5.1	8.0	0.1	

111	Savagaon	..	773	697	57	19	90.2	7.4	2.4
112	Boknur	..	370	332	20	18	89.7	5.4	4.9
113	Mandoli	..	1,002	935	64	3	93.3	6.4	0.3
114	Belgundi	..	1,406	1,216	142	47	1	86.5	10.1	3.3	0.1
115	Sonoli	..	624	577	3	41	3	92.4	0.5	6.6	0.5
116	Yelebail	..	222	218	4	98.2	1.8
117	Rakaskop	..	411	392	2	17	95.4	0.5	4.1
118	Bijagarni	..	1,150	1,101	18	31	95.7	1.6	2.7
119	Machhe	..	2,198	1,433	596	169	65.2	27.1	7.7
120	Majagaon	..	4,653	2,241	1,938	474	48.2	41.6	10.2
122	Dhamne S. Belgaum	..	3,362	1,887	1,158	317	56.1	34.4	9.4
123	Sulage (Yellur)	..	543	534	9	98.3	1.7
125	Desur	..	1,297	989	193	114	1	76.2	14.9	8.8	0.1
126	Nandihalli	..	1,591	1,234	357	77.6	22.4
127	Nagenhatti	..	166	152	14	91.6	8.4
128	Rajahansgad	..	540	488	52	90.4	9.6
129	Hosagondanhatti	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D.
130	Zadshahapur	..	229	222	7	96.9	3.1
131	Navage	..	624	483	137	2	2	77.4	22.0	0.3	0.3
132	Kuttalwadi	..	164	65	99	39.6	60.4
133	Hangargi	..	760	684	76	90.0	10.0
134	Kiniye	..	795	722	57	16	90.8	7.2	2.0
135	Dhamne S. Bailur	..	150	150	100.0
136	Karle	..	559	555	3	1	99.3	0.5	0.2
137	Bhadurwadi	..	329	256	67	6	77.8	20.4	1.8
138	Badas Inam	..	439	431	3	4	1	98.2	0.7	0.9	0.2
139	Belvatti	..	666	652	2	10	2	97.9	0.3	1.5	0.3
140	Bakanur	..	187	185	2	98.9	1.1
141	Santibastwad	..	1,523	482	862	179	..	31.6	56.6	11.7

TALUKA BELGAUM

DISTRICT BELGAUM

Location Code No. of the Village or Town	Name of the Village or Town	Popula- tion	Mother Tongue (Absolute Figures)				Mother Tongue (Percentages)			
			Marathi	Kannada	Others	Un- specified	Marathi	Kannada	Others	Un- specified
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
<i>Villages—concl'd.</i>										
142	Ranakunde ..	453	344	30	79	..	75·9	6·6	17·4	..
143	Waghawade ..	965	733	187	45	..	76·0	19·4	4·6	..
144	Somanaikanhatti ..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D.	
145	Jaitanmal ..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D.	
146	Susgoudanhatti ..	2	2	100·0

TALUKA KHANAPUR

DISTRICT BELGAUM

H 5104-14

Location Code No. of the Village or Town	Name of the Village or Town	Population	Mother Tongue (Absolute Figures)				Mother Tongue (Percentages)			
			Marathi	Kannada	Others	Un-specified	Marathi	Kannada	Others	Un-specified
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
<i>Towns</i>										
17-9-1	Khanapur	.. 6,134	3,043	1,383	1,653	55	49.6	22.5	27.0	0.9
17-9-74	Nandgad	.. 5,343	2,096	1,450	1,780	17	39.2	27.1	33.3	0.3
<i>Villages</i>										
32	Jainkop	.. 138	127	6	5	..	92.0	4.3	3.6	..
36	Lokoli 926	787	94	45	..	85.0	10.1	4.9	..
37	Sannahosur	.. 232	209	8	15	..	90.1	3.4	6.5	..
38	Topinkatti	.. 1,301	1,179	120	2	..	90.6	9.2	0.2	..
40	Allihol 118	106	..	4	8	89.8	..	3.4	6.8
41	Bacholi	.. 116	86	30	74.1	25.9
42	Balgi 242	82	160	33.9	66.1
43	Balikodal	.. D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D.	
44	Bankibasarikatti	.. 156	65	44	47	..	41.7	28.2	30.1	..
45	Baragaon	.. 452	339	25	87	1	75.0	5.5	19.2	0.2
46	Bekwad 887	717	79	82	9	80.8	8.9	9.2	1.0
47	Bhandargali	.. 205	172	1	8	24	83.9	0.5	3.9	11.7
49	Bhutewadi	.. 252	239	7	6	..	94.8	2.8	2.4	..
50	Channewadi	.. 194	170	22	1	1	87.6	11.3	0.5	0.5
51	Chapgaon	.. 887	632	237	18	..	71.3	26.7	2.0	..
52	Doddebail	.. 112	106	6	94.6	5.4
53	Doddahosur	.. 466	336	125	1	4	72.1	26.8	0.2	0.9

TALUKA KHANAPUR

DISTRICT BELGAUM

Location Code No. of the Village or Town	Name of the Village or Town	Population	Mother Tongue (Absolute Figures)				Mother Tongue (Percentages)				
			Marathi	Kannada	Others	Un- specified	Marathi	Kannada	Others	Un- specified	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
	<i>Villages—contd.</i>										
55	Hadalgi	.. 349	286	62	1	..	81.9	17.8	0.3	..	
56	Halkarni	.. 249	109	139	..	1	43.8	55.8	..	0.4	
57	Halshi	.. 2,144	1,332	500	312	..	62.1	23.3	14.6	..	
58	Harsetkop	.. D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D.		
59	Hattargunji	.. 223	223	100.0	
60	Hebbal	.. 1,046	891	80	75	..	85.2	7.6	7.2	..	
61	Jalaga	.. 445	430	15	96.6	3.4	
62	Junjawad-K-Godihalli	305	254	50	..	1	83.3	16.4	..	0.3	
63	Junjawad-K-Nandgad	616	499	64	53	..	81.0	10.4	8.6	..	
67	Karalgi	.. 930	845	63	21	1	90.9	6.8	2.2	0.1	
69	Khairwad	.. 623	498	125	79.9	20.1	
70	Kemewadi	.. 85	85	100.0	
71	Kupattageri	.. 646	554	86	6	..	85.8	13.3	0.9	..	
73	Nandgad Kasaba	.. 942	792	47	103	..	84.1	5.0	10.9	..	
74	Nandgad Moje	.. D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D.		
75	Nanjinkodal	.. 253	238	13	2	..	94.1	5.1	0.8	..	
77	Ramgurwadi	.. 627	606	21	96.7	3.3	
78	Rumewadi	.. 577	470	76	30	1	81.4	13.2	5.2	0.2	
79	Sagari	.. 226	200	26	88.5	11.5	

80	Sivoli	..	251	211	37	3	..	84.1	14.7	1.2	..
82	Vanakebail	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D.	..
83	Yadoga	..	297	267	30	89.9	10.1
84	Alloli Kansoli	..	303	291	9	..	3	96.0	3.0	..	1.0
85	Ambewadi	..	50	49	1	98.0	2.0
86	Ambalikop	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D.	..
87	Anagadi	..	264	254	10	96.2	3.8
88	Bhalaka Budruk	..	44	44	100.0
89	Bhalaka Khurd	..	45	44	1	97.8	2.2
90	Bhistenhatti	..	66	24	21	21	..	36.4	31.8	31.8	..
92	Bijagarni	..	433	408	25	94.2	5.8
93	Bimbegali	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D.	..
94	Chanakebail	..	27	10	9	8	..	37.0	33.3	29.6	..
96	Dhokegali	..	98	93	5	94.9	5.1
97	Gangawali	..	111	107	4	96.4	3.6
99	Ghotagalli	..	303	292	11	96.4	3.6
100	Godgeri	..	624	548	71	5	..	87.8	11.4	0.8	..
101	Godoli	..	1,029	687	127	215	..	66.8	12.3	20.9	..
102	Gundoli	..	209	59	53	95	2	28.2	25.4	45.4	1.0
103	Gundapi	..	415	339	33	40	3	81.7	8.0	9.6	0.7
104	Gunji	..	1,080	783	140	155	2	72.5	13.0	14.3	0.2
105	Halage	..	622	593	24	4	1	95.3	3.9	0.6	0.2
106	Halsal	..	293	281	9	3	..	95.9	3.1	1.0	..
107	Harasanwadi	..	145	135	9	1	..	93.1	6.2	0.7	..
108	Haruri	..	289	262	27	90.7	9.3
109	Hattarwad	..	436	356	72	7	1	81.7	16.5	1.6	0.2
111	Jangamhatti	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D.	..
112	Jatage	..	239	229	10	95.8	4.2
113	Karajgi	..	157	115	12	29	1	73.2	7.6	18.5	0.6

TALUKA KHANAPUR

DISTRICT BELGAUM

Location Code No. of the Village or Town	Name of the Village or Town	Population	Mother Tongue (Absolute Figures)				Mother Tongue (Percentages)			
			Marathi	Kannada	Others	Un- specified	Marathi	Kannada	Others	Un- specified
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
	<i>Village—contd.</i>									
114	Karambal	.. 740	670	51	17	2	90.5	6.9	2.3	0.3
115	Karanjal	.. 62	52	10	83.9	16.1
117	Kavandal	.. 407	353	18	36	..	86.7	4.4	8.8	..
118	Kirhalashi	.. 292	252	23	17	..	86.3	7.9	5.8	..
119	Kumaratwadi	.. D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D.	
121	Manikuadi	.. 323	289	34	89.5	10.5
122	Manaturge	.. 499	403	13	83	..	80.8	2.6	16.6	..
123	Maskenhatti	.. 106	69	37	65.1	34.9
124	Mendegali	.. 284	266	17	..	1	93.7	6.0	..	0.3
125	Merda	.. 305	262	27	16	..	85.9	8.8	5.2	..
126	Modekoppa	.. 204	197	7	96.6	3.4
127	Mudaganur	.. D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D.	
128	Naikol	.. D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D.	
129	Navage	.. 333	226	6	101	..	67.9	1.8	30.3	..
130	Padalwadi	.. 84	58	12	13	1	69.0	14.3	15.5	1.2
131	Pur	.. 250	145	43	62	..	58.0	17.2	24.8	..
132	Sangargali	.. 489	207	26	256	..	42.3	5.3	52.4	..
133	Savargali	.. 146	131	4	10	1	89.7	2.7	6.9	0.7
134	Shedegali	.. 261	246	15	94.3	5.7

135	Sindoli	..	151	126	24	1	..	83.4	15.9	0.7	..
136	Simpewadi	..	149	134	15	89.9	10.1
137	Sonenhatti	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D.	..
138	Tivoli	..	466	257	20	188	1	55.2	4.3	40.3	0.2
139	Otoli	..	127	110	17	86.6	13.4
140	Abanali	..	104	102	2	98.1	1.9
141	Adali	..	86	84	2	97.7	2.3
142	Akrali	..	330	309	21	93.6	6.4
143	Awaratbail	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D.	..
144	Balgund	..	124	60	6	58	..	48.4	4.8	46.8	..
145	Bamankop	..	54	52	2	96.3	3.7
146	Bastwad	..	58	50	2	5	1	86.2	3.4	8.6	1.7
147	Betane	..	164	149	14	..	1	90.9	8.5	..	0.6
148	Bhatewadi	..	38	37	1	97.4	2.6
149	Budse	..	7	6	1	85.7	14.3
150	Chapoli	..	210	184	10	16	..	87.6	4.8	7.6	..
151	Chinchewadi	..	20	20	100.0
152	Daroli	..	68	62	2	4	..	91.2	2.9	5.9	..
153	Digegalli	..	126	121	5	96.0	4.0
154	Dongargaon	..	196	193	1	1	1	98.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
155	Ghose Bk.	..	41	41	100.0
156	Ghose Kh.	..	86	83	3	96.5	3.5
157	Gharli	..	132	128	4	97.0	3.0
158	Golvali	..	413	395	18	95.6	4.4
159	Hemadage	..	243	206	24	11	2	84.8	9.9	4.5	0.8
160	Jambegali	..	107	36	2	69	..	33.6	1.9	64.5	..
161	Jamboli	..	1,147	1,064	78	1	4	92.8	6.8	0.1	0.3
162	Jamgaon	..	100	82	2	16	..	82.0	2.0	16.0	..
163	Kabanali	..	11	11	100.0

TALUKA KHANAPUR

DISTRICT BELGAUM

Location Code No. of the Village or Town	Name of the Village or Town	Population	Mother Tongue (Absolute Figures)				Mother Tongue (Percentages)					
			Marathi	Kannada	Others	Un- specified	Marathi	Kannada	Others	Un- specified		
											4	5
	<i>Villages—contd.</i>											
164	Kalageri	.. D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D.			
165	Kalakoppa	.. D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D.			
166	Kalmani	.. 352	335	16	..	1	95.2	4.5	..	0.3		
167	Kalnaikhatti	.. D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D.			
168	Kalyali	.. D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D.			
169	Kamatge	.. 263	254	7	1	1	96.6	2.7	0.4	0.4		
170	Kanjale	.. 92	90	2	97.8	2.2		
171	Kanakumbi	.. 1,061	930	96	32	3	87.7	9.0	3.0	0.3		
172	Kapoli-K—Chapoli.	.. 238	235	3	98.7	1.3		
173	Kapoli-K—Gunji	.. 682	651	27	3	1	95.4	4.0	0.4	0.1		
174	Karanjwade	.. D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D.			
175	Kirapoli	.. D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D.			
176		.. D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D.			
177	Kirwale K. Gunji	.. 85	82	3	96.5	3.5		
178	Kodagai	.. 97	65	2	30	..	67.0	2.1	30.9	..		
179	Kongala	.. 67	63	4	94.0	6.0		
180	Kumbarde	.. 125	96	23	6	..	76.8	18.4	4.8	..		
181	Londa	.. 2,404	1,664	232	504	4	69.2	9.6	21.0	0.2		
182	Machali	.. 43	42	1	97.7	2.3		
183	Malavi	.. 43	40	3	93.0	7.0		

184	Manjarpai-KiGhat gali.	53	51	2	96.2	3.8
185	Manjarpai-K-Kakkeri.	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D.	
186	Mohiset	205	189	14	..	2	92.2	6.8	..	1.0
187	Mugwade	.. 150	145	5	96.7	3.3
188	Mudawadpimple	.. 115	112	2	1	..	97.4	1.7	0.9	..
189	Nagargali	.. 288	115	113	60	..	39.9	39.2	20.8	..
190	Nilawade	.. 173	166	7	96.0	4.0
191	Nerse	.. 277	268	8	..	1	96.7	2.9	..	0.4
192	Olmani	.. 520	496	20	4	..	95.4	3.8	0.8	..
193	Posekopp	.. D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D.	
194	Potoli	.. 29	29	100.0
195	Satanali	.. 39	39	100.0
196	Sindoli Bk.	.. 72	70	2	97.2	2.8
197	Sindoli Kh.	.. 68	67	1	98.5	1.5
198	Siroli	.. 333	318	12	..	3	95.5	3.6	..	0.9
199	Sithawade	.. 169	158	11	93.5	6.5
200	Sivathana	.. 198	189	9	95.5	4.5
201	Somaset	.. D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D	
202	Sulegali	.. 23	23	100.0
203	Suwatwadi	.. 76	73	3	96.1	3.9
204	Talawade	.. 259	247	12	95.4	4.6
205	Tarwad	.. 70	67	3	95.7	4.3
206	Tavargatti	.. 319	178	43	71	27	55.8	13.5	22.3	8.4
207	Teregali	.. 77	76	1	98.7	1.3
208	Varkhadpatiya	.. 247	240	5	2	..	97.2	2.0	0.8	..
209	Vatre	.. 131	124	7	94.7	5.3
210	Amgaon	.. 173	159	6	8	..	91.9	3.5	4.6	..
211	Chigule	.. 333	328	5	98.5	1.5

TALUKA KHANAPUR

DISTRICT BELGAUM

Location Code No. of the Village or Town	Name of the Village or Town	Population	Mother Tongue (Absolute Figures)				Mother Tongue (Percentages)			
			Marathi	Kannada	Others	Un- specified	Marathi	Kannada	Others	Un- specified
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
	<i>Villages—contd.</i>									
212	Chikale	.. 414	386	27	..	1	93·2	6·5	..	0·2
213	Chorla	.. 756	737	13	..	5	97·5	1·7	0·7	0·1
214	Deogaon	.. 35	33	2	94·3	5·7
215	Gavali	.. 327	53	13	..	257	16·2	4·0	78·6	1·2
216	Gavase	.. 40	37	2	..	1	92·5	5·0	2·5	..
217	Holda	.. 28	25	1	..	2	89·3	3·6	7·1	..
218	Hulland	.. 185	183	2	98·9	1·1
219	Kelil	.. 27	22	1	..	4	81·5	3·7	14·8	..
220	Mendil	.. 59	55	4	93·2	6·8
221	Parwad	.. 517	489	21	..	7	94·6	4·1	1·3	..
222	Pastoli	.. 46	43	2	..	1	93·5	4·3	..	2·2
223	Tanali <i>alias</i> Bhimgad.	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D.	
224	Devachinatti	.. 67	65	2	97·0	3·0
225	Habanatti	.. 157	150	7	95·5	4·5
226	Torali	.. 323	312	11	96·6	3·4
227	Amboli	.. 184	177	7	96·2	3·8
228	Amte	.. 607	579	28	95·4	4·6
229	Ankale	.. 362	359	3	99·2	0·8
230	Devarai	.. 317	192	49	..	76	60·6	15·4	24·0	..
231	Dukarwadi	.. 111	105	6	94·6	5·4

232	Ghodedurg	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D.	
233	Honakal	..	317	306	9	..	2	96.5	2.8	..	0.6
234	Kavale	..	40	40	100.0
235	Malawad	..	319	315	3	..	1	98.8	0.9	..	0.3
236	Mudewadi	..	111	110	1	99.1	0.9
237	Nagurade	..	247	230	17	93.1	6.9
238	Asoga	..	437	421	16	96.3	3.7
239	Manasapur	..	577	148	28	400	1	25.6	4.9	69.3	0.2
240	Morab	..	55	54	1	98.2	1.8
241	Kokati	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D	
242	Betageri	..	50	48	2	96.0	4.0
243	Tirthkunde	..	340	176	162	..	2	51.8	47.6	..	0.6
244	Sonarwadi	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D.	
245	Bailur	..	526	514	9	1	2	97.7	1.7	0.2	0.4
246	Kusamali	..	198	183	13	..	2	92.4	6.6	..	1.0
247	Uchawade	..	99	93	5	1	..	93.9	5.1	1.0	..
248	Nittur	..	333	307	18	1	7	92.2	5.4	0.3	2.1
249	Katagali	..	200	194	6	97.0	3.0
250	Genebail	..	289	264	25	91.3	8.7
251	Nidgal	..	516	460	55	..	1	89.1	10.7	..	0.2
252	Idalhond	..	763	716	31	15	1	93.8	4.1	2.0	0.1
253	Singenkop	..	225	155	70	68.9	31.1
254	Garalgunji	..	2,183	2,020	163	92.5	7.5
255	Bidarbhavi	..	366	269	96	..	1	73.5	26.2	..	0.3

TALUKA CHIKODI

DISTRICT BELGAUM

Location Code No. of the Village or Town	Name of the Village or Town	Population	Mother Tongue (Absolute Figures)				Mother Tongue (Percentages)			
			Marathi	Kannada	Others	Un-specified	Marathi	Kannada	Others	Un-specified
<i>Towns</i>										
17-II	Nipani Municipality.	24,325	16,202	3,761	4361	1	66.6	15.5	17.9	..
17-3-V	Karadaga	.. 5,948	4,074	1,429	445	..	68.5	24.0	7.5	..
17-3-IX	Kongnolli	.. 6,004	4,282	1,146	576	..	71.3	19.1	9.6	..
<i>Villages.</i>										
1	Adi	.. 2,195	1,129	1,037	18	11	51.4	47.2	0.8	0.5
2	Akol	.. 5,479	3,325	1,849	305	..	60.7	33.7	5.6	..
3	Barwad	.. 1,326	1,068	229	29	..	80.5	17.3	2.2	..
4	Benadi	.. 4,448	2,000	2,365	83	..	44.9	53.2	1.9	..
5	Bhivashi	.. 1,242	1,200	22	19	1	96.6	1.8	1.5	0.1
6	Budihal	.. 1,093	1,002	77	14	..	91.7	7.0	1.3	..
7	Hanchinal K. Sava-gaon.	1,669	1,551	64	50	4	92.9	3.8	3.0	0.2
8	Hunnargi	.. 2,230	1,001	803	425	1	44.9	36.0	19.1	..
10	Jatrat	.. 2,922	2,842	70	10	..	97.3	2.4	0.3	..
11	Kasnal	.. 479	461	18	96.2	3.8
12	Kodni	.. 2,713	2,359	260	94	..	86.9	9.6	3.5	..

13	Kurli	.. 4,408	4,350	54	4	..	98.7	1.2	0.1	..
14	Lakhnapur	.. 1,103	498	551	54	..	45.1	50.0	4.9	..
15	Mangur 3,153	2,183	754	214	2	69.2	23.9	6.8	0.1
16	Amalzari (Hamlet of Nipani)	635	582	31	22	..	91.6	4.9	3.5	..
17	Padlihal 1,060	1,049	2	9	..	99.0	0.2	0.8	..
18	Saundalga	.. 3,710	3,374	111	95	130	90.9	3.0	2.6	3.5
19	Shidnal 1,319	682	550	87	..	51.7	41.7	6.6	..
20	Bhatnagnur	.. 605	584	6	13	2	96.5	1.0	2.2	0.3
22	Gondikuppi	.. 1,032	1,022	4	1	5	99.0	0.4	0.1	0.5
23	Hadnalde	.. 849	848	1	99.9	0.1
24	Matiwade	.. 855	742	100	13	..	86.8	11.7	1.5	..
27	Shendur	.. 2,010	1,737	216	1	56	86.4	10.7	0.1	2.8
28	Shiraguppi	.. 1,804	1,737	8	59	..	96.3	0.4	3.3	..
29	Suligaon	.. 733	721	7	4	1	98.4	1.0	0.5	0.1
30	Yarnal	.. 1,197	1,129	56	9	3	94.3	4.7	0.8	0.2
55	Budalmukh	.. 587	571	8	8	..	97.2	1.4	1.4	..
62	Kunnur 4,137	2,751	973	388	25	66.5	23.5	9.4	0.6
64	Mamdapur K. Lat	.. 1,587	1,365	171	49	2	86.0	10.8	3.1	0.1
66	Manakapur	.. 2,646	1,985	580	81	..	75.0	21.9	3.1	..
68	Pangeri	.. 960	945	14	1	..	98.4	1.5	0.1	..
69	Tavadi	.. 1,035	1,026	5	1	3	99.1	0.5	0.1	0.3
82	Pangire	.. 832	541	222	69	..	65.0	26.7	8.3	..
83	Pattanakudi	.. 4,257	2,104	1,611	507	35	49.4	37.9	11.9	0.8
85	Chikhalwhal	.. 1,508	1,217	272	18	1	80.7	18.0	1.2	0.1
87	Peerwadi	.. 81	77	2	..	2	95.0	2.5	..	2.5
88	Nangnoor	.. 1,380	1,351	9	16	4	97.9	0.6	1.2	0.3
89	Yamagarni	.. 1,300	963	79	250	8	74.1	6.1	19.2	0.6
90	Rampur	.. 1,005	364	582	59	..	36.2	57.9	5.9	..

TALUKA ATHNI

DISTRICT BELGAUM

Location Code No. of the Village or Town	Name of the Village or Town	Population	Mother Tongue (Absolute Figures)				Mother Tongue (Percentages)			
			Marathi	Kannada	Others	Un- specified	Marathi	Kannada	Others	Un- specified
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
	<i>Villages</i>									
9	Ugar Kh.	.. 5,675	2,722	2,228	724	1	48.0	39.3	12.7	..
10	Lokur	.. 1,557	1,015	522	20	..	65.2	33.5	1.3	..
11	Mangsuli	.. 4,956	2,930	1,606	420	..	59.1	32.4	8.5	..
71	Shirur	.. 1,318	976	285	55	2	74.1	21.6	4.2	0.1
72	Pandegaon	.. 1,159	1,104	39	16	..	95.2	3.4	1.4	..
74	Sambargi	.. 1,752	998	707	33	14	57.0	40.3	1.9	0.8
77	Kalloti	.. 545	272	250	23	..	49.9	45.9	4.2	..
79	Jambagi	.. 1,945	1,116	801	28	..	57.4	41.2	1.4	..
81	Arlihatti	.. 1,346	1,124	167	52	3	83.5	12.4	3.9	0.2
82	Bannal	.. 605	392	194	19	..	64.8	32.1	3.1	..

TALUKA HUKERI

DISTRICT BELGAUM

Location Code No. of the Village or Town	Name of the Village or Town	Population	Mother Tongue (Absolute Figures)				Mother Tongue (Percentages)			
			Marathi	Kannada	Others	Un-specified	Marathi	Kannada	Others	Un-specified
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
	<i>Villages</i>									
8	Bhairapur	.. 706	632	69	5	..	89.5	9.8	0.7	..
10	Bugte Alur	.. 1,118	1,102	16	—	..	98.6	1.4	—	—
17	Hadalge	.. 838	680	93	65	..	81.1	11.1	7.8	..
22	Hittani	.. 1,414	1,051	350	13	..	74.3	24.8	0.9	..
41	Nagnur-K-Solapur	.. 336	291	42	3	..	86.6	12.5	0.9	..
44	Rashing	.. 758	754	4	99.5	0.5
46	Shekinhosur	.. 230	120	110	52.2	47.8
77	Daddi	.. 1,508	584	573	351	..	38.7	38.0	23.3	..
78	Khavanewadi	.. 346	327	19	94.5	5.5
79	Kot	.. 1,007	688	304	15	..	68.3	30.2	1.5	..
80	Modge	.. 929	883	35	11	..	95.0	3.8	1.2	..
82	Ramewadi	.. 940	596	154	190	..	63.4	16.4	20.2	..
84	Bellanki	.. 172	169	3	98.3	1.7
86	Dhondgatti	.. 444	412	32	92.8	7.2
87	Salamwadi	.. 833	658	172	3	..	79.0	20.6	0.4	..
88	Shettihalli	.. 818	782	36	95.6	4.4
112	Shipur	.. 1,347	1,305	40	2	..	96.9	3.0	0.1	..
113	Matiwade	.. 1,350	1,116	214	20	..	82.7	15.8	1.5	..

TALUKA KARWAR

Location Code No. of the Village or Town	Name of the Village or Town	Popula- tion	Mother Tongue (Absolute Figures)					Mother Tongue (Percentages)				
			Marathi	Kannada	Kon- kani	Others	Un- specified	Marathi	Kannada	Kon- kani	Others	Un- specified
			4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
<i>Towns</i>												
20—I	Karwar	.. 19,744	3,474	5,568	9,039	1,607	56	17.6	28.2	45.8	8.1	0.3
20-1—I	Chitkula	.. 6,315	145	367	4,855	943	5	2.3	5.8	76.9	14.9	0.1
20-1—II	Majali	.. 5,820	818	692	4,252	49	9	14.0	11.9	73.1	0.8	0.2
<i>Villages</i>												
7	Baad Tikka II	.. 2,092	4	345	1,742	1	..	0.2	16.5	83.3
7A	Baad	.. 463	9	34	420	1.9	7.3	90.7
8	Nandangadde	.. 2,611	22	424	1,766	399	..	0.8	16.2	67.6	15.3	..
9	Sunkeri	.. 451	..	104	339	8	23.0	75.2	1.8	..
10	Kathinkon	.. 1,579	3	155	1,165	256	..	0.2	9.8	73.8	16.2	..
11	Makheri	.. 631	4	4	623	0.6	0.6	98.7
12	Shirwad	.. 880	75	201	602	2	..	8.5	22.8	68.4	0.2	..
13	Kadwad	.. 2,609	..	690	1,645	274	26.4	63.1	10.5	..
14	Kinnar	.. 2,459	..	288	2,021	150	11.7	82.2	6.1	..
15	Siddar	.. 848	1	114	733	0.1	13.4	86.4
16	Wailwada	.. 1,059	..	174	885	16.4	83.6
17	Devalmakki	.. 501	..	49	439	13	9.8	87.6	2.6	..

18	Naitisaver	..	441	..	96	343	2	21.8	77.8	0.4	..
24	Kanasgiri	..	594	13	37	544	2.2	6.2	91.6
25	Arav	..	659	17	2	635	5	..	2.6	0.3	96.4	0.7	..
26	Hosali	..	768	3	1	622	142	..	0.4	0.1	81.0	18.5	..
27	Mudgeri	..	2,208	24	96	2,005	69	14	1.1	4.3	90.8	3.1	0.6
28	Angadi	..	588	6	11	551	20	..	1.0	1.9	93.7	3.4	..
29	Kolge	..	267	10	1	246	10	..	3.7	0.4	92.1	3.7	..
30	Madhewada	..	969	17	43	905	4	..	1.8	4.4	93.4	0.4	..
31	Savantwada	..	298	8	9	277	4	..	2.7	3.0	93.0	1.3	..
32	Hotegali	..	1,278	..	1	1,171	106	0.1	91.6	8.3	..
33	Hankon	..	1,056	4	50	1,002	0.4	4.7	94.9
34	Gopshitta	..	444	15	4	423	2	..	3.4	0.9	95.3	0.4	..
35	Maingini	..	49	6	..	43	12.2	..	87.8
36	Bhaire	..	763	4	2	746	10	1	0.5	0.3	97.8	1.3	0.1
37	Goyar	..	40	34	6	85.0	15.0	..
38	Lande	..	59	4	..	55	6.8	..	93.2
39	Kamergaon	..	60	1	..	59	1.7	..	98.3
40	Gotegali	..	837	..	9	823	5	1.1	98.3	0.6	..
41	Balemane	..	63	..	19	31	13	30.2	49.2	20.6	..
42	Kadra	..	320	20	13	282	5	..	6.2	4.1	88.1	1.6	..
43	Hankon-Joog	..	323	..	1	314	8	0.3	97.2	2.5	..
44	Halge-Joog	..	779	694	84	1	89.1	10.8	0.1
45	Bolshitta	..	657	..	62	561	33	1	..	9.4	85.4	5.0	0.2
46	Ghadsai	..	1,565	29	196	1,323	17	..	1.9	12.5	84.5	1.1	..
47	Ulge	..	1,083	..	17	1,066	1.6	98.4
48	Katar	..	553	6	4	543	1.1	0.7	98.2
49	Kerwadi	..	464	..	23	441	5.0	95.0
50	Kadiye	..	448	..	1	447	0.2	99.8
51	Mallapur	..	621	2	14	552	53	..	0.3	2.3	88.9	8.5	..

TALUKA KARWAR

DISTRICT KARWAR

Location Code No. of the Village or Town	Name of the Village or Town	Popula- tion	Mother Tongue (Absolute Figures)					Mother Tongue (Percentages)				
			Marathi	Kannada	Kon- kani.	Others	Unspeci- fied	Marathi	Kannada	Kon- kani	Others	Unspeci- fied
			4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
	<i>Villages—contd.</i>											
52	Virge	.. 175	..	57	104	14	32.6	59.4	8.0	..
53	Kuchegar	.. 84	..	40	44	47.6	52.4
54	Hartuge	.. 89	..	24	65	27.0	73.0
55	Kaiga	.. 163	..	28	135	17.2	82.8
56	Devkar	.. 229	1	106	122	0.4	46.3	53.3

H 5104-15 PETA SUPA

DISTRICT KARWAR

Location Code No. of the Village or Town	Name of the Village or Town	Popula- tion	Mother Tongue (Absolute Figures)					Mother Tongue (Percentages)					
			Marathi	Kannada	Kon- kani	Others	Unspeci- fied	Marathi	Kannada	Kon- kani	Others	Un- specified	
			4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
<i>Villages</i>													
1	Palde	..	108	107	..	1	99.1	..	0.9
2	Viranjole	..	49	49	100.0
3	Rangarook	..	37	37	100.0
4	Vatle	..	62	62	100.0
5	Akheti	..	192	192	100.0
6	Karambal	..	143	133	1	7	2	..	93.0	0.7	4.9	1.4	..
7	Varlewadi	..	66	66	100.0
8	Devulli (Tinai)	..	600	325	172	49	53	1	54.2	28.7	8.2	8.8	0.1
9	Anmod	..	223	186	9	26	2	..	83.4	4.0	11.7	0.9	..
10	Payaswadi	..	162	49	106	7	30.3	65.4	4.3
11	Atali	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D.
12	Kalambuli	..	3,153	1,350	182	842	778	1	42.8	5.8	26.7	24.7	..
13	Ivoli	..	155	151	4	..	97.4	2.6	..
14	Kungini	..	35	31	..	4	88.6	..	11.4
15	Kuveshi	..	118	110	7	1	93.2	5.9	0.9
16	Aveda Phophal- wadi.	..	33	33	100.0
17	Ninnur	..	83	17	..	66	20.5	..	79.5
18	Bandode	..	58	12	..	46	20.7	..	79.3

PETA SUPA

DISTRICT KARWAR

Location Code No. of the Village or Town	Name of the Village or Town	Popula- tion	Mother Tongue (Absolute Figures)					Mother Tongue (Percentages)				
			Marathi	Kannada	Kon- kani	Others	Unspeci- fied	Marathi	Kannada	Kon- kani	Others	Un- specified
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
<i>Villages—contd.</i>												
19	Bajar Kumang ..	76	61	3	12	80·3	3·9	15·8
20	Pisose ..	65	1	..	59	..	5	1·5	..	90·8	..	7·7
21	Shirgure ..	28	19	..	8	..	1	67·8	..	28·6	..	3·6
22	Viral ..	49	6	..	42	..	1	12·2	..	85·7	..	2·0
23	Kevarle ..	90	12	..	78	13·3	..	86·7
24	Konshet ..	229	207	9	12	..	1	90·4	3·9	5·2	..	0·5
25	Chandwadi ..	134	134	100·0
26	Durg ..	52	52	100·0
27	Vilayedabe ..	115	114	..	1	99·1	..	0·9
28	Ghavane ..	13	13	100·0
29	Titwali ..	66	64	2	97·0	3·0
30	Kamre ..	138	138	100·0
31	Boregali ..	53	52	1	..	98·1	1·9	..
32	Chaphali ..	45	45	100·0
33	Asu ..	406	398	2	6	98·0	0·5	1·5
34	Bori ..	2	2	100·0
35	Shindolli ..	147	147	100·0
36	Vade ..	50	50	100·0
37	Kasarle ..	22	22	100·0

38	Velipkumbeli ..	55	11	28	15	1	..	20·0	50·9	27·3	1·8	..
39	Miraskumbeli ..	25	24	..	1	96·0	..	4·0
40	Amshet ..	52	2	2	48	3·8	3·8	92·3
41	Malambe ..	9	8	..	1	88·9	..	11·1
42	Kundalgaon ..	D	E	S	E	R	..	T	..	E	D.	..
43	Timboli ..	60	59	..	1	98·3	..	1·7
44	Vaijagaon ..	64	57	..	7	89·1	..	10·9
45	Kasarwadi ..	8	8	100·0
46	Shingargaon ..	161	145	5	6	5	..	90·1	3·1	3·7	3·1	..
47	Donshet ..	D	E	S	E	R	..	T	..	E	D.	..
48	Usoda ..	52	23	7	..	21	1	44·2	13·5	..	40·4	1·9
49	Pusheli ..	46	18	..	28	39·1	..	60·9
50	Jagalbet ..	475	334	81	50	9	1	70·3	17·1	10·5	1·9	0·2
51	Bamanawadi ..	51	45	1	5	88·2	2·0	9·8
52	Kumbral ..	23	22	1	95·7	4·3
53	Vaini ..	120	99	..	21	82·5	..	17·5
54	Durgi ..	D	E	S	E	R	..	T	..	E	D.	..
55	Varande ..	43	43	100·0
56	Adangaon ..	33	33	100·0
57	Bhamarde ..	100	100	100·0
58	Kurandi ..	27	2	1	23	1	..	7·4	3·7	85·2	3·7	..
59	Aveda ..	52	16	..	36	30·8	..	69·2
60	Konada ..	D	E	S	E	R	..	T	..	E	D.	..
61	Kondpe ..	D	E	S	E	R	..	T	..	E	D.	..
62	Mavalinge ..	D	E	S	E	R	..	T	..	E	D.	..
63	Badagund ..	19	18	1	94·7	5·3
64	Konada (Near Supa)	266	74	17	84	91	..	27·8	6·4	31·6	34·2	..
65	Virkhol ..	105	89	7	5	4	..	84·8	6·7	4·7	3·8	..

PETA SUPA

DISTRICT KARWAR

Location Code No. of the Village or Town	Name of the Village or Town	Popula- tion	Mother Tongue (Absolute Figures)					Mother Tongue (Percentages)				
			Marathi	Kannada	Kon- kani	Others	Unspeci- fied	Marathi	Kannada	Kon- kani	Others	Unspeci- fied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
<i>Villages—contd.</i>												
66	Supa ..	54	51	..	3	94·4	..	5·6
67	Ambeli ..	918	319	64	508	27	..	34·8	7·0	55·3	2·9	..
68	Diggi ..	117	15	11	90	1	..	12·8	9·4	76·9	0·9	..
69	Asulli ..	226	20	2	203	1	..	8·9	0·9	89·8	0·4	..
70	Sulawali ..	26	18	..	8	69·2	..	30·8
71	Karanjoda ..	393	10	..	382	..	1	2·5	..	97·2	..	0·3
72	Phanaskhand ..	4	4	100·0
73	Terali ..	142	79	..	60	3	..	55·6	..	42·3	2·1	..
74	Kukdali ..	66	54	..	12	81·8	..	18·2
75	Jamgali ..	43	35	..	8	81·4	..	18·6
76	Hatkhamba ..	35	18	..	17	51·4	..	48·6
77	Asangaon ..	183	117	2	64	63·9	1·1	35·0
78	Dongarwada ..	99	62	..	37	62·6	..	37·4
79	Kukre-Kurwade..	49	49	100·0
80	Maisoda ..	D	E	S	E	R		T	E	D		
81	Pate ..	79	61	..	18	77·2	..	22·8
82	Panjeli ..	187	168	..	19	89·8	..	10·2
83	Nagoda ..	17	144	6	28	80·9	3·4	15·7
84	Adulli ..	20	20	100·0

85	Khodli	..	93	2	..	91	2.2	..	97.8
86	Bapeli	..	14	14	100.0
87	Virampali	..	832	77	74	243	438	..	9.3	8.9	29.2	52.6	..
88	Pardhani	..	33	33	100.0
89	Amarde	..	D	E	S	E	R	E	R	T	E	D	..
90	Gavegali	..	149	70	1	75	3	..	47.0	0.7	50.3	2.0	..
91	Phansoli	..	63	7	..	53	3	..	11.1	..	84.1	4.8	..
92	Sangwe	..	47	47	100.0
93	Kalamkhand	..	70	10	35	10	15	..	14.3	50.0	14.3	21.4	..
94	Virnoli	..	97	9	9	79	9.3	9.3	81.4
95	Amagaon	..	44	11	1	16	16	..	25.0	2.3	36.4	36.4	..
96	Shiroli	..	36	15	..	15	6	..	41.7	..	41.7	16.6	..
97	Sannamaga	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D
98	Kavale	..	84	..	10	41	33	11.9	48.8	39.3	..
99	Samjoida	..	48	47	1	97.9	2.1	..
100	Birode	..	156	7	..	149	4.5	..	95.5
*101	Chapoli (A)
102	Chapkhanda	..	3	3	100.0
103	Nagre	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D
104	Joida	..	692	36	76	542	38	..	5.2	11.0	78.3	5.5	..
105	Devulli (Joida)	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D
106	Tinaikhand	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D
107	Chapoli (K)	..	353	353	100.0
108	Gangoda	..	168	168	100.0
109	Kumbeli	..	16	16	100.0
110	Kalsai	..	328	328	100.0
111	Ghodshet	..	121	9	1	111	7.4	0.8	91.7
112	Deriye	..	41	41	100.0
113	Katel	..	31	31	100.00

PETA SUPA

DISTRICT KARWAR

Location Code No. of the Village or Town	Name of the Village or Town	Population	Mother Tongue (Absolute Figures)					Mother Tongue (Percentages)				
			Marathi	Kannada	Kon-kani	Others	Un-specified	Mara-thi	Kannada	Kon-kant	Others	Un-specified
<i>Villages—contd.</i>												
114	Kateli	361	21	9	324	6	1	5.8	2.5	89.7	1.7	0.3
115	Jhalawadi	84	7	..	71	6	..	8.3	..	84.5	7.1	..
116	Kundal ;	183	28	5	142	7	1	15.3	2.7	77.6	3.8	0.6
117	Nujji	281	277	4	98.6	1.4	..
118	Badpoli	114	114	100.0
119	Nigundi	108	108	100.0
120	Anshi	292	..	4	275	13	1.4	94.2	4.4	..
121	Bidoli	88	88	100.0
122	Ambolli	241	..	2	237	..	2	..	0.8	98.3	..	0.8
123	Chapher	15	15	100.0
124	Tulasgeri	17	..	3	14	17.6	82.4
125	Vadkal	25	12	13	48.0	52.0	..
126	Ulvi	116	2	13	26	75	..	1.7	11.2	22.4	64.7	..
132	Hudsa	27	27	100.0
133	Avurli	23	1	..	21	1	..	4.3	..	91.3	4.3	..
134	Gund	60	..	3	53	4	5.3	88.3	6.7	..
135	Nandigadde	131	1	20	98	12	..	0.8	15.3	74.8	9.1	..
136	Chinchkand	44	..	10	34	22.7	77.3

*The 1951 Census population of village No. 101-Chapoli (A), according to the District Census Handbook, is 20.

TALUKA HALIYAL

DISTRICT KARWAR

Location Code No. of the Village or Town	Name of the Village or Town	Popula- tion	Mother Tongue (Absolute Figures)					Mother Tongue (Percentages)					
			Marathi	Kannada	Kon- kani.	Others	Unspeci- fied	Mara- thi	Kannada	Kon- kani	Others	Unspeci- fied	
			4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
20-VI	Town HaliyalMuni- cipality villages	8,184	2,905	2,144	811	2,324	..	35.5	26.2	9.9	28.4	..	
1	Alolli	..	46	29	7	..	10	..	63.0	15.2	..	21.7	..
2	Kalsapur	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	..	E	D.
4	Kerwad	..	395	240	65	81	9	..	60.8	16.4	20.5	2.3	..
5	Magwad	..	21	21	100.0
7	Antrolli	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	..	E	D.
8	Muttalmuri	..	494	361	48	7	76	2	73.1	9.7	1.4	15.4	0.4
9	Satnalli	..	451	384	17	30	10	10	85.1	3.8	6.7	2.2	2.2
10	Mundki	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	..	E	D.
11	Arlwad	..	570	332	176	2	58	2	58.3	30.9	0.3	10.2	0.3
12	Homnalli	..	100	41	46	13	41.0	46.0	13.0
13	Madnalli	..	530	13	516	1	2.4	97.4	0.2
14	Dusgi	..	457	412	31	12	1	1	90.2	6.8	2.6	0.2	0.2
15	Hunswad	..	743	610	128	..	5	..	82.1	17.2	..	0.7	..
16	Malwad	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	..	E	D.
17	Pala	..	181	171	..	10	94.5	..	5.5
18	Ambodga	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	..	E	D.
19	Mangalwad	..	1,720	1,334	154	157	75	..	77.6	8.9	9.1	4.4	..
20	Bidrolli	..	306	265	16	16	8	1	86.6	5.2	5.2	2.6	0.3
21	Yedoga	..	984	762	58	104	56	4	77.4	5.9	10.6	5.7	0.4
22	Harwalli	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	..	E	D.

TALUKA HALIYAL

DISTRICT KARWAR

Location Code No. of the Village or Town	Name of the Village or Town	Popula- tion	Mother Tongue (Absolute figures)					Mother Tongue (Percentage)					
			Marathi	Kannada	Kon- kani	Others	Unspeci- fied	Marathi	Kan- nada	Kon- kani	Others	Un- speci- fied	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
	<i>Villages—contd.</i>												
23	Modalgari ..	116	93	13	1	9	..	80.2	11.2	0.9	7.7	..	
24	Ramapur ..	6	6	100.0	
25	Jawalli ..	150	109	12	10	19	..	72.7	8.0	6.6	12.7	..	
26	Satmani ..	112	97	15	..	86.6	13.4	..	
27	Timmapur ..	111	92	4	..	15	..	82.9	3.6	..	13.5	..	
28	Baloga ..	D		E	S	E	R	T		E	D		
29	Channapur ..	D		E	S	E	R	T		E	D		
30	Niralgi ..	236	225	10	..	1	..	95.3	4.2	..	0.4	..	
31	Bablikop ..	D		E	S	E	R	T		E	D		
32	Halshi ..	D		E	S	E	R	T		E	D		
33	Kesrolli ..	131	65	20	..	44	2	49.6	15.3	..	33.6	1.5	
34	Domgeri ..	33	..	32	..	1	97.0	..	3.0	..	
35	Ajagaon ..	42	28	2	..	12	..	66.6	4.8	..	28.6	..	
36	Agsalkatta ..	14	13	..	1	92.9	..	7.1	
37	Kurigadde ..	89	71	18	79.8	20.2	
38	Siddapur ..	D		E	S	E	R	T		E	D		
39	Karlkatta ..	217	201	4	..	12	..	92.6	1.9	..	5.5	..	
40	Kyatanger ..	17	17	100.0	
41	Gardolli ..	209	155	16	..	38	..	74.2	7.6	..	18.2	..	
42	Gadgeri ..	26	23	3	88.5	11.5	

43	Kalginhatti	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D	
44	Kesrodga	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D	
45	Shingatgeri	..	94	7	6	15	66	7.4	6.4	16.0	70.2
46	Handli	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D	
47	Gobral	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D	
48	Ajagarni	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D	
49	Bedarshirgur	..	152	57	53	4	38	..	37.5	34.9	2.6	25.0	..
50	Vitnal	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D	
51	Haregali	..	165	66	8	79	12	..	40.0	4.8	47.9	7.3	..
52	Ambewadi	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D	
53	Alur	..	85	84	1	98.8	1.2
54	Tatgeri	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D	
55	Karwad (Dandeli)	..	50	46	4	92.0	8.0
56	Dandeli	..	187	75	20	16	76	..	40.1	10.7	8.6	40.6	..
57	Kumbarkop	..	2,431	273	630	501	1,027	..	11.2	25.9	20.6	42.3	..
58	Kariampali	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D	
59	Badakanshirda	..	109	87	3	16	3	..	79.8	2.7	14.	2.7	..
60	Harnoda	..	6	6	100.0
61	Hoskumbarkop	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D	
62	Mainal	..	18	..	1	..	17	5.6	..	94.4	..
63	Rayapattan	..	23	23	100.0
64	Chimnalli	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D	
65	Narnalli	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D	
66	Balshettikop	..	57	35	..	19	3	..	61.4	..	33.3	5.3	..
67	Malwadi	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D	
68	Badashirgur	..	37	37	100.0
69	Chotakanshirda	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D	
70	Malwad	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D	
71	Thakarbasapur	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D	

TALUKA HALIYAL

DISTRICT KARWAR

Location Code No. of the Village or Town	Name of the Village or Town	Popula- tion	Mother Tongue (Absolute Figures)					Mother Tongue (Percentage)						
			Marathi		Kannada	Kon- kani	Others	Un- specified	Marathi		Kannada	Kon- kani	Others	Un- specified
			4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13		
	<i>Villages—contd.</i>													
72	Kalbhavi ..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D					
73	Donshirgur ..	65	65	100.0	
74	Kulgi ..	305	82	18	188	17	..	26.9	5.9	61.6	5.6	
75	Bommanalli ..	61	31	3	8	19	..	50.8	4.9	13.1	31.2	
76	Kegdai ..	100	37	1	48	14	..	37.0	1.0	48.0	14.0	
77	Gutti ..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D					
78	Bhagwati ..	286	59	39	88	100	..	20.6	13.6	30.8	35.0	
79	Addigera ..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D					
80	Vincholi ..	23	19	..	1	3	..	82.6	..	4.4	13.0	
81	Jamaga ..	85	34	2	40	9	..	40.0	2.4	47.0	10.6	
82	Amge ..	47	46	..	1	97.9	..	2.1	
83	Bhimnalli ..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D					
84	Bogur ..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D					
85	Tattigeri ..	411	153	28	13	217	..	37.2	6.8	3.2	52.8	
86	Mavinkop ..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D					
87	Machapur ..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D					
88	Jatgehousur ..	39	34	5	87.2	12.8	
89	Adkehosur ..	80	5	1	12	62	..	6.3	1.2	15.0	77.5	
90	Hosur ..	93	53	1	9	30	..	57.0	1.1	9.7	32.2	
91	Dodkop ..	141	105	6	24	6	..	74.5	4.2	17.0	4.2	
92	Nilwani ..	60	59	1	98.3	1.7	

93	Bukkankop	..	128	71	25	28	4	..	55.5	19.5	21.9	3.1	..
94	Hampehalli	..	291	232	20	27	12	..	79.7	6.9	9.3	4.1	..
95	Kawalwad	..	758	475	161	7	115	..	62.7	21.2	0.9	15.2	..
97	Baswalli	..	220	175	20	3	20	2	79.5	9.1	1.4	9.1	0.9
98	Nandigadde	..	564	476	44	12	30	2	84.4	7.8	2.1	5.3	0.4
100	Janage	..	774	642	57	..	75	..	82.9	7.4	..	9.7	..
101	Khurd-Kanchanalli	..	364	313	11	..	40	..	86.0	3.0	..	11.0	..
102	Murkwad	..	1,111	765	119	13	209	5	68.9	10.7	1.2	18.8	0.4
103	Mugadkop	..	56	2	54	3.6	96.4
104	Jatge	..	22	22	100.0	..
105	Chinginkop	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D
106	Ajminhal	..	30	30	100.0
107	Sambarani	..	340	138	58	33	110	1	40.6	17.1	9.7	32.3	0.3
108	Gundolli	..	816	604	35	68	108	1	74.0	4.3	8.3	13.2	0.1
109	Tippingeri	..	93	84	1	..	8	..	90.3	1.1	..	8.6	..
110	Kalginkop	..	529	414	52	12	51	..	78.3	9.8	2.3	9.6	..
111	Pur	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D
112	Kumbarkop	..	39	33	1	5	84.6	2.6	12.8
113	Arashinageri	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D
114	Malwadi	..	302	237	39	15	11	..	78.5	12.9	5.0	3.6	..
115	Chibalgeri	..	280	240	13	13	14	..	85.7	4.6	4.6	5.0	..
116	Golehalli	..	226	99	13	29	85	..	43.8	5.8	12.8	37.6	..
117	Kamdalli	..	260	227	9	22	2	..	87.3	3.5	8.5	0.7	..
118	Guttibail	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D
119	Tegnalli	..	188	146	18	77.7	9.6	..	12.8	..
120	Bhanasgeri	..	D	E	S	E	R	T	E	D
121	Buzurkanchanalli	..	1,050	894	137	2	17	..	85.1	13.1	0.2	1.6	..
122	Tatwani	..	438	168	92	63	115	..	38.4	21.0	14.4	26.2	..
123	Nagshettikop	..	342	283	26	13	15	5	82.7	7.6	3.8	4.4	1.5

TAHSIL HUMNABAD

DISTRICT BIDAR

Number and Name of Village	Popula- tion	Mother Tongue (Absolute Figures)					Mother Tongue (Percentages)				
		Telugu	Mara- thi	Kan- nada	Others	Unspeci- fied	Telugu	Mara- thi	Kan- nada	Others	Unspeci- fied
		3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
31. Landvanti ..	1,530	12	1,190	217	111	..	1	78	14	7	..
32. Dhamori ..	148	7	138	3	5	93	2
33. Yekamba ..	744	..	687	37	20	92	5	3	..
34. Gadlegaon ..	264	..	229	3	32	87	1	12	..
35. Ramtirth ..	432	10	237	178	7	..	2	55	41	2	..
37. Sirgur ..	358	..	253	97	8	71	27	2	..
43. Chikota B. ..	376	..	273	65	38	73	17	10	..
44. Siruri ..	265	1	177	4	83	67	2	31	..
45. Bhosga ..	1,430	334	564	288	243	1	23	40	20	17	..
46. Bhanknal ..	221	25	182	14	11	83	6
47. Waddarga ..	397	..	354	16	27	89	4	7	..
48. Harkud ..	932	6	68	575	283	..	1	7	62	30	..
49. Ujlamb ..	2,545	800	1,478	157	104	6	32	58	6	4	..
50. Manhalli ..	511	11	392	86	22	..	2	77	17	4	..
51. Chitta ..	850	8	679	117	46	..	1	80	14	5	..
64. Honnali ..	445	32	412	1	7	93
65. Hindral ..	197	28	158	11	14	80	6
70. Parwatpur ..	1,894	8	770	576	540	41	30	29	..
72. Nilkanth ..	414	143	219	43	9	..	35	53	10	2	..
98. Urki ..	446	11	293	111	31	..	2	66	25	7	..

102.	Thalbhog	..	801	5	733	25	38	..	1	91	3	5	..
103.	Janjanmugli	..	1,667	221	1,111	117	167	1	13	67	10	10	..
104.	Ghotala	..	1,773	441	1,071	186	105	..	23	60	11	6	..
105.	Chandkapur	..	778	99	591	73	15	..	13	76	9	2	..
106.	Umapur	..	557	6	265	130	156	..	1	48	23	28	..
107.	Laheshwar	..	141	..	36	32	73	25	23	52	..
109.	Morkhandi	..	1,654	249	983	385	37	..	15	60	23	2	..
110.	Ramtirth	..	533	7	517	3	6	..	1	97	1	1	..

TAHSIL BHALKI

DISTRICT BIDAR

Number and Name of Village	Popula- tion	Mother Tongue (Absolute Figures)					Mother Tongue (Percentages)				
		Telugu	Mara- thi	Kan- nada	Others	Unspeci- fied	Telugu	Mara- thi	Kan- nada	Others	Unspeci- fied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
<i>Villages.</i>											
1. Kalsar Tugaon..	1,091	..	635	424	32	58	39	3	..
2. Seoni ..	1,016	11	477	426	101	1	1	47	42	10	..
3. Lakhangaon ..	2,122	..	1,468	426	225	3	..	69	20	11	..
4. Kaknal ..	605	..	486	57	62	80	10	10	..
5. Hatnur ..	123	..	123	100
6. Sonapur ..	305	..	288	17	94	6
7. Talewadi ..	824	7	689	97	31	..	1	83	12	4	..
8. Lanjwada ..	549	..	289	226	33	1	..	53	41	6	..
9. Bhat Sangvi ..	1,100	1	1,042	6	51	95	..	5	..
10. Melkunda Methi	1,005	27	645	286	47	..	3	64	28	5	..
11. Telgaon ..	483	..	454	..	29	94	..	6	..
12. Bhatambra ..	2,753	70	705	1,311	665	2	2	26	48	24	..
100. Madkatti ..	1,398	6	952	369	64	2	..	68	27	5	..
101. Korur ..	426	1	363	..	62	85	..	15	..
103. Gor Chincholi	1,100	..	702	333	65	64	30	6	..
104. Kotgira ..	478	..	229	131	118	48	27	25	..
123. Gaur ..	1,045	62	390	316	276	1	6	37	30	27	..
124. Khandala ..	809	37	170	585	17	..	5	21	72	2	..
125. Gutti ..	552	..	535	8	9	97	1	2	..
126. Bellura ..	2,419	9	281	2,052	75	2	..	12	85	3	..
127. Gound Gaon ..	1,499	28	778	570	123	..	2	52	38	8	..

131.	Kuntegaon ..	376	24	221	131	6	59	35
132.	Ladha ..	1,004	146	425	373	60	..	15	42	37	6	..
133.	Vinchur ..	488	..	487	1	100
134.	Khudavantpur	474	..	367	91	16	78	19	3	..
135.	Halsi ..	517	..	269	203	45	52	39	9	..
136.	Girgial ..	168	..	150	18	89	11
137.	Wagalgaon ..	310	..	60	209	41	19	68	13	..
138.	Saigaon ..	2,131	14	1,617	440	60	76	21	3	..
139.	Dabaka Sol ..	522	..	516	..	6	99	..	1	..
140.	Kesar Jawalga	1,041	..	539	484	18	52	46	2	..
141.	Kadibad ..	196	57	111	28	29	57	14
142.	Hulsur ..	3,880	218	948	1,998	714	2	6	24	52	18	..
143.	Deonal ..	525	12	387	13	113	..	2	74	2	22	..
144.	Mirkhal ..	2,317	21	1,595	431	270	..	1	69	18	12	..
145.	Kotmal ..	771	13	668	42	48	..	2	87	5	6	..
146.	Machnal ..	267	..	199	33	35	75	12	13	..
147.	Jamkhandi ..	788	..	772	16	98	2
148.	Wanjerkhed ..	914	..	462	194	258	51	21	28	..
149.	Kongli ..	729	..	663	57	9	91	8	1	..
150.	Mehkar ..	2,557	9	1,520	881	146	1	..	59	35	6	..
151.	Narda Sangam	337	1	294	42	87	13
152.	Bolegaon B. ..	798	..	453	341	4	57	43
153.	Sirmali ..	572	1	392	33	146	69	6	25	..
154.	Tugaon ..	1,798	..	1,252	408	137	1	..	70	23	7	..
155.	Alwai ..	1,391	..	1,048	148	195	75	11	14	..
156.	Gunjara tarfe Attarga	347	..	344	1	2	99	..	1	..
157.	Attarga ..	586	..	575	11	98	2
158.	Mankeshwar ..	378	..	344	14	20	91	4	5	..

TAHSIL SANTPUR (AURAD)

DISTRICT BIDAR

Number and Name of Village	Popula- tion	Mother Tongue (Absolute Figures)					Mother Tongue (Percentages)				
		Telugu	Mara- thi	Kan- nada	Others	Unspeci- fied	Telugu	Mara- thi	Kan- nad	Others	Unspeci- fied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Aurad Barahalli.	3,789	331	836	1,668	953	1	9	22	44	25	..
2. Wannarpalli ..	425	..	261	159	5	62	37	1	..
3. Dudkanal ..	558	..	414	128	16	74	23	3	..
4. Ekamba ..	1,476	25	941	126	384	..	2	64	8	26	..
5. Badalagaon ..	329	..	316	6	7	96	2	2	..
6. Ganeshpur ..	295	..	295	100
21. Khandekeri ..	406	15	238	11	142	..	4	58	3	35	..
33. Boral ..	366	..	196	170	54	46
34. Mungnal ..	569	4	367	158	40	..	1	64	28	7	..
35. Maha Dongaon.	419	2	304	4	109	73	1	26	..
42. Hangara B. ..	834	7	696	67	64	..	1	83	8	8	..
43. Hulyal ..	471	..	285	27	159	60	6	34	..
44. Jamalpur ..	343	..	334	9	97	3
45. Hassekeri ..	250	..	144	65	41	58	26	16	..
46. Goudgaon ..	353	..	250	..	103	71	..	29	..
47. Korekal ..	762	..	595	142	25	78	19	3	..
48. Bewalgaon ..	986	101	599	95	191	..	10	61	10	19	..
49. Sawargaon ..	701	2	642	11	46	92	2	6	..
96. Lingadhalli ..	128	..	114	..	14	89	..	11	..
97. Bemra ..	334	1	296	18	19	89	5	6	..
98. Chandori ..	675	10	430	212	23	..	2	64	31	3	..

100.	Torna ..	1,571	13	919	458	181	..	1	58	29	12	..
101.	Nandi Bijalgaon.	779	2	613	44	120	79	6	15	..
102.	Mukhed ..	667	17	511	41	98	..	2	77	6	15	..
103.	Hokrana ..	1,324	8	906	222	188	..	1	68	17	14	..
104.	Kherda B. ..	1,063	16	868	141	38	..	1	62	13	4	..
105.	Dabkachor ..	1,471	..	1,010	186	275	69	12	19	..
106.	Chikli ..	1,135	..	555	111	469	49	10	41	..
107.	Akanapur ..	76	..	76	100
108.	Ganganbid ..	329	..	237	50	42	72	15	13	..
109.	Ganeshpur Udgir.	331	..	308	..	23	93	..	7	..
110.	Wanjarkhed <i>alias</i> Wangangera.	148	..	43	..	105	29	..	71	..
111.	Bhandar Kumtha	1,076	24	721	48	283	..	2	67	5	26	..
112.	Mukti ..	1,657	13	789	683	172	..	1	48	41	10	..
113.	Handikera ..	772	1	527	54	190	68	7	25	..
114.	Chimegaon ..	792	1	635	84	73	80	11	9	..
115.	Malegaon ..	497	1	147	105	244	30	21	49	..
116.	Dongergaon Nittur.	442	..	425	2	15	96	1	3	..
117.	Sannanal ..	201	16	122	63	8	61	31
118.	Karkgal ..	586	13	319	193	61	..	2	55	33	10	..
119.	Belkuni Maqta.	1,089	..	655	329	105	60	30	10	..
120.	Dongaon Maqta.	1,030	..	433	519	78	42	50	8	..
121.	Hakial ..	415	..	111	295	9	27	71	2	..
122.	Rendial ..	212	..	66	146	31	69
123.	Bijalgaon ..	433	..	373	60	86	14
124.	Modhol K. ..	506	..	493	12	1	98	2
125.	Modhol B. ..	1,641	83	312	929	317	..	5	19	57	19	..
126.	Korial ..	229	..	125	49	55	55	21	24	..
127.	Tapshial ..	360	..	329	31	91	9

TAHSIL SANTPUR (AURAD)

DISTRICT BIDAR

Number and Name of Village	Popula- tion	Mother-tongue (Absolute Figures)					Mother-tongue (Percentages)								
		Telugu		Mara- thi		Kan- nada	Others	Unspeci- fied	Telugu		Mara- thi		Kan- nada	Others	Unspeci- fied
		3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12				
128. Bonthi ..	867	11	515	15	326	..	1	59	2	38	..				
129. Daregaon	D E S	E R T	E D				
130. Lingi ..	431	..	399	1	31	93	..	7	..				
131. Mukhed ..	357	..	326	1	30	91	..	9	..				
132. Khatgaon ..	812	9	254	463	86	..	1	31	57	11	..				
133. Madnur ..	1,106	28	283	707	88	..	2	26	64	8	..				
134. Rampur	D E S	E R T	E D				
135. Murug K. ..	372	..	372	100				
136. Murug B. ..	2,099	36	752	825	486	..	2	36	39	23	..				
137. Holsamanadar	1,236	..	792	350	94	64	28	8	..				
138. Basnal ..	181	..	28	143	10	15	79	6	..				
139. Diggi ..	570	..	248	322	44	56				
140. Sawli ..	1,075	..	848	42	185	79	4	17	..				
142. Kotgiyal ..	728	22	263	312	31	..	3	50	42	4	..				
143. Khed ..	914	3	339	512	60	37	56	7	..				
144. Hulsur ..	733	39	451	147	96	..	5	62	20	13	..				
145. Kalgapur ..	802	11	618	134	39	..	1	77	17	5	..				
146. Chandeshwar ..	771	..	359	369	43	47	48	5	..				
147. Balur ..	398	..	309	89	78	22				
148. Korandi ..	656	..	446	197	12	1	..	68	30	2	..				
149. Sanoli ..	1,249	1	174	963	111	14	77	9	..				

TAHSIL ALAND

DISTRICT GULBARGA

Number and Name of Village	Popula- tion	Mother Tongue (Absolute Figures)					Mother Tongue (Percentages)				
		Telugu	Mara- thi	Kan- nada	Others	Unspeci- fied	Telugu	Mara- thi	Kan- nad	Others	Unspeci- fied
		3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13. Janga Khandala.	397	..	194	129	74	49	32	19	..
14. Tadola ..	1,287	1	949	243	94	74	19	7	..
15. Sirooru (Gadlegaon).	476	..	338	120	18	71	25	4	..
16. Gadlegaon ..	243	..	184	..	59	76	..	24	..
17. Alanga ..	1,166	..	778	299	88	1	..	67	26	7	..
21. Jawalgi ..	648	2	311	281	53	1	1	48	43	8	..
23. Tugaon; ..	521	..	441	54	26	85	10	5	..
26. Nandgoonu ..	240	..	161	79	67	33

APPENDIX V

(Vide paragraphs 6·80, 6·139 and 6·145)

Nature of hardships of the Marathi-speaking people in the border areas in Mysore

References have been made in some of the chapters of this memorandum to the inconveniences and hardships felt by the Marathi-speaking people in the border areas of Mysore. The Kannad-speaking people had also experienced similar inconveniences when they were divided and formed the tail-ends of linguistically different States. Karnatak Provincial Congress Committee and the Karnatak Ekikaran Mahasamiti had, in 1948, voiced an identical grievance in the following words :—

“ As it is not possible for a Provincial Government to give adequate importance to a language which is spoken by a small minority of its population, the efficiency of the administration is bound to suffer, and the people speaking the minority language are the worst sufferers ”. (Page 30, “ Linguistic Provinces and the Karnatak Problem ”).

The grievances of the Marathi-speaking people in the disputed areas are numerous. Some of the important ones are mentioned below :

(i) Marathi-speaking persons are denied Government employment on the plea that they do not know Kannad.

(ii) Marathi students cannot compete with Kannada students through Kannad language. Their chances for scholarships rewards, awards, admission to technical or other higher courses have diminished.

(iii) As most of the Judges, Magistrates and other judicial staff do not know Marathi, the cause of justice in litigation which involves consideration of evidence in Marathi suffers.

(iv) Members of the public have to approach frequently Government and semi-government offices for their day to day business such as Post and Telegraphs, Sales-Tax, Income Tax, Registration, etc. Marathi not being a recognised language of business, Marathi-speaking people find it difficult to transact business and put across their view point effectively.

(v) Students have to learn five languages including Kannad at a tender age. This is too taxing a burden for them.

(vi) In Marathi schools employing Marathi teachers, orders and circulars of Government are received in Kannad, which they find difficult to understand. It has been the experience that the schools do not get qualified Marathi teachers

(vii) The Marathi-speaking people are not adequately represented the various bodies constituted to promote development programmes. The Marathi-speaking M.L.As. also find it difficult to bring home such points as they cannot make themselves effective in a house having an overwhelming majority of Kannad-speaking representatives.

(viii) In matters such as the script on milestones, signposts, application forms, notices, electoral rolls, etc. Kannad is replacing Marathi even in the Marathi majority areas.

(ix) The grampanchayats of even predominantly Marathi-speaking villages have been directed to maintain their records in Kannad. Their difficulty can be easily understood.

(x) The communications addressed to Government Offices by Marathi-speaking people do not receive prompt and adequate attention, apparently due to the difficulty of language. Similarly Government communications received by the Marathi-speaking people being in Kannad, they are hard put to read and understand them.

It is not this Government's contention that these hardships are deliberately inflicted on the Marathi-speaking people but the fact remains that the common man is put to severe hardships administration and otherwise. This Government desires to emphasise the point that they are avoidable and can be easily removed to a great extent, by a rational demarcation of the boundary between the two States.

APPENDIX

(Vide para

Statement showing Nakawise collections on account of Octroi

Name of Naka	Situation of the Naka	Income of Octroi	
		1954-55	1955-56
1	2	3	4
		Rs.	Rs.
1. Dharwar ..	On Belgaum-Dharwar Road ..	72,496	1,14,259
2. Supplement Dharwar..	At Jinna Chowk as a check to naka 1, 3 and 4.	1,510	2,486
3. Kasai ..	Near Port on Belgaum-Bagalkot Road.	75,962	98,218
	Total from Kannada areas ..	1,49,973	2,14,955
4. Kaladgi ..	On Poona-Belgaum Road (near Police Headquarters).	52,604	63,233
5. Kaktives ..	On Poona-Belgaum Road (near Dy. Commissioner's Office).	85,973	1,01,112
6. Vengurla ..	On Belgaum-Vengurla Road ..	77,144	80,459
7. Ramghat ..	On Ramghat road leading to Coastal area.	9,170	10,838
8. At Bogarves ..	At Bogarves to check goods coming from Western sides.	3,796	5,926
9. Nagzari ..	At Tilakwadi near Angol road. (On Belgaum-Khanapur Road).	88,151	86,543
10. Khanapur ..	Near Telegraph office on Belgaum-Khanapur Road.	3,620	3,156
11. Vaccine Depot ..	Second Railway gate, Tilakwadi ..	6,314	7,048
12. Shahapur ..	Near R. P. D. College on Belgaum-Khanapur Road.	1,215	1,374
13. Kapileshwar ..	At Wadgaonves Shahapur ..	4,810	4,226
14. Khasbag ..	Check Naka for No. 13 ..	1,467	1,529
15. Hosur ..	Moving check naka for Hosur area ..	1,003	1,680
16. Patilves ..	Near Railway Station (Parcel Naka)..	82,884	91,529

VI (1)
graph 6.47)
duties in the Belgaum Municipal Limits.

in Rupees				Remarks
1956-57	1957-58	1958-59	1959-60	
5	6	7	8	9
Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	
1,04,044	1,17,243	1,54,494	1,53,607	Road comes from Kannada areas.
3,301	2,493	2,253	1,760	Do. do.
90,429	85,821	93,584	94,699	Road comes from Kannada area but having Marathi areas upto 10 miles to the east of Belgaum Town.
1,97,774	2,05,557	2,50,331	2,50,066	
85,159	1,02,401	1,21,483	1,53,971	Road comes predominantly from Maharashtra area, and goods mostly arrive from Bombay and Kolhapur by trucks.
1,10,300	74,399	75,372	64,007	
83,267	81,568	72,201	83,140	Roads coming from south Ratnagiri districts, Chandgad and Marathi parts of Belgaum Taluka.
9,009	10,534	10,465	9,222	
9,371	8,386	10,419	8,876	
82,867	83,509	96,607	1,06,469	Road coming from Khanapur, Karwar, Halyal, Supa, Goa, all purely Marathi area.
3,818	4,196	1,229	2,069	
9,606	8,553	8,310	5,703	For roads coming from Western and Southern sides purely Marathi areas.
2,392	4,944	2,592	7,473
4,798	4,553	3,892	3,343	For Wadgaon and Yellur side purely Marathi areas.
1,189	1,227	1,280	1,459	Check Naka for No. 13.
1,600	864	724	635	Do.
98,842	1,06,927	1,04,757	93,674	Mainly for Railway parcel and goods coming from Khanapur side.

APPENDIX

Name of Naka	Situation of the Naka	Income of Octroi	
		1954-55	1955-56
1	2	3	4
		Rs.	Rs.
17. Goods shed	.. Near Goods shed ..	4,51,777	3,99,159
18. Municipal Office	.. Municipal Office ..	1,67,491	1,47,281
19. Post parcels	*13,742
Total from Marathi areas		.. 10,38,156	10,18,866
Grand total		.. 11,88,129	12,33,821

N. B.—More than 80 per cent of the collection at Goods shed and Patilves nakas are on

AVERAGE

		Rs.
Income from Kannad areas	2,11,442
Income from goods and Patilves nakas—20 per cent.		1,06,445
Total		.. 3,17,887
Income from Marathi areas	6,40,594
Income from goods and Patilves nakas—80 per cent.		4,25,781
Total		.. 10,66,375

VI (1)—*contd.*

in Rupees				Remarks
1956-57	1957-58	1958-59	1959-60	
5	6	7	8	9
Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	
4,48,603	4,79,226	4,11,190	4,24,791	For Goods arriving by Railway.
2,84,894	2,32,490	2,87,576	2,85,057	Accounts of deposits kept by merchants on account of octroi are verified and adjusted. These account pertains to the goods coming from Bombay etc. mostly Marathi area.
15,252	12,445	26,883	25,522	
*(Amounts recovered on post parcels.)				
12,50,967	12,16,222	12,34,900	12,75,411	
14,48,741	14,21,779	14,85,231	15,25,477	

account of goods arriving from Bombay directly.

APPENDIX VI(2)

(Vide paragraph 6.73)

Statement showing the imports of Jaggery and Tobacco into the Nipani Municipality area during the Year 1954-55

Name of Naka	Imports in the year 1954-55		From what areas
	Jaggery B. Maunds	Tobacco B. Maunds	
Kolhapur ..	82,213	1,75,188	Marathi speaking areas.
Murgud ..	1,87,305	18,768	Do.
Jatrat ..	1,637	2,402	Do.
Out Agency ..	9	1,183	Do.
Belgaum ..	26,969	1,08,623	Jaggery mainly from Marathi speaking area and Tobacco mostly from Marathi speaking area and to some extent from Kannada area.
Chikodi ..	29,551	90,681	Do.
Total ..	3,27,684	3,96,845	

Certified that the above figures are furnished as per Octroi records of the Municipality and they are correct.

Copy applied for on 23rd August 1964.

Prepared by

Copy ready for delivery on 24th August 1964.

Copy delivered on 24th August 1964.

(Signed).....

Number of words 96 only.

Copying fee .. Rs. a. p.
0 3 0

Comparing fee .. 0 0 6

Compared by

Paper .. 0 2 0

0 5 6

(Signed).....

Municipal Borough, Nipani.

(True copy)

(Signed).....

Chief Officer,
Municipal Borough, Nipani.

APPENDIX VI (2)—contd.

Statement showing the Imports of Tobacco and Jaggery into the Municipal area during the year 1957-58, 1958-59 and 1959-60

Name of Nakas	IMPORTS						From what area
	1975-58		1958-59		1959-60		
	Jaggery B-Maunds	Tobacco B-Maunds	Jaggery B-Maunds	Tobacco B-Manuds	Jaggery B-Maunds	Tobacco B-Maunds	
Kolhapur ..	32,900	1,47,200	31,000	1,87,500	39,000	1,37,400	Maharashtra and Marathi speaking areas.
Murgud ..	35,800	12,000	67,000	20,500	24,120	6,970	Do. do.
Jatrat ..	660	1,270	860	1,240	940	1,250	Marathi speaking areas.
Belgaum ..	13,960	64,550	17,400	89,900	12,150	58,110	Approximately 50 per cent. tobacco from Marathi-speaking areas and 50 per cent. from Kannadi speaking areas and jaggery mostly from Marathi speaking area.
Chikodi ..	37,230	5,800	30,300	63,650	31,300	45,425	Do. do.
Out-Agency ..	30	180	2,470	3,430	Marathi-speaking areas.
Remaining ..	1,550	1,220	1,340	1,115	1,390	1,050	Do. do.
Total ..	1,22,130	2,82,220	1,47,900	3,66,375	1,18,900	2,53,635	

Certified that the above figures are furnished as per Octroi records of the Municipality and they are correct.

Copy applied for on 23rd August 1964.
 Copy ready for delivery on 24th August 1964.
 Copy delivered on 24th August 1964.
 Number of words—154 only.

	Rs.	a.	P.
Copying Fee 0	6	0
Comparing Fee 0	0	6
Paper 0	2	0

0 8 6

Prepared by
 (Signed)

Compared by
 (Signed)

Municipal Borough,
 Nipani.

(True Copy)
 (Signed).....,
 Chief Officer,
 Municipal Borough, Nipani.

APPENDIX

Statement showing the imports of Tobacco, Jaggery, Chillies, Foodgrains into the

IMPORTS						
Name of Nakas	1960-61			1961-62		
	Tobacco B. Mds.	Jaggery B. Mds.	Chillies B. Mds.	Tobacco B. Mds.	Jaggery B. Mds.	
Kolhapur ..	2,18,701	59,800	2,372	2,02,021	48,263	
Murgud ..	13,378	37,499	522	16,461	34,773	
Jatrat ..	1,052	1,320	69	1,217	1,030	
Belgaum ..	84,826	17,754	6,832	88,997	20,280	
Chikodi ..	90,371	47,872	4,413	80,300	57,722	
Out-Agency ..	1,011	4	2	329	Nil.	
Remaining ..	580	1,705	1,206	1,236	731	
Total ..	4,09,919	1,65,954	15,416	3,90,561	1,62,799	

Certified that the above figures are furnished as per Octroi

Copy applied for on 23rd August 1964.

Prepared by

Copy ready for delivery on 24th August 1964.

(Signed).....

Copy delivered on 24th August 1964.

Number of words 186 only.

Compared by

Rs. a. P.

Copying fee .. 0 6 0

Comparing fee .. 0 0 6

(Signed).....

Paper .. 0 2 0

0 8 6

(True copy)

Municipal Borough, Nipani.

(Signed).....
Chief Officer,

Municipal Borough, Nipani.

VI (2)—contd.

Nipani Municipal Areas during the Years 1960-61, 1961-62 and 1962-63

IMPORTS				From what areas
1962-63				
Chillies B. Mds.	Tobacco B. Mds.	Jaggery B. Mds.	Chillies B. Mds.	
4,038	77,777	26,749	1,281	Maharashtra and Marathi speaking areas.
583	11,451	45,685	2,454	Do. do.
398	675	558	537	Marathi speaking areas.
6,950	60,913	13,749	5,338	Approximately 50 per cent. tobacco from Marathi speaking areas and 50 per cent. from Kannad speaking areas and jaggery mostly from Marathi speaking areas.
9,712	66,896	37,131	8,846	Do. do.
2	1,034	19	15	Marathi speaking area.
628	772	737	1,137	Do. do.
22,311	3,29,518	1,24,628	19,608	

records of the Municipality and they are correct.

APPENDIX VI (2)—concl'd.

Statement showing the import of Tobacco, Jaggery, Chillies into Nipani Municipal area during the years 1963-64 and from 1st April 1964 to 31st July 1964

Name of Naka	Imports for 1963-64			Imports from 1st April 1964 to 31st July 1964			From what area
	Tobacco B-Maunds	Jaggery B-Maunds	Chillies B-Maunds	Tobacco B. Maunds	Jaggery B. Maunds.	Chillies B. Maunds	
Kolhapur ..	2,18,759	1,53,029	2,435	70,275	9,760	577	Maharashtra and Marathi speaking areas.
Murgud ..	13,761	20,650	780	5,615	931	156	Do. do.
Jatrat ..	553	1,668	314	84	282	55	Marathi speaking areas.
Belgaum ..	97,413	21,706	6,502	15,855	11,085	1,157	Approximately 50 per cent. Tobacco from Marathi-speaking areas and 50 per cent. from Kannada speaking areas and Jaggery mostly from Marathi areas.
Chikodi ..	1,01,669	52,728	17,198	28,619	24,928	3,219	Do. do.
Out-Agency ..	479	3	26	126	18	8	Marathi-speaking areas.
Remaining ..	959	1,451	1,297	61	446	97	Do. do.
Total ..	4,33,593	2,51,235	28,532	1,20,635	46,450	5,269	

Certified that the above figures are furnished as per octroi records of the Municipality and they are correct.

Copy applied for on 23rd August 1964.
 Copy ready for delivery on 24th August 1964.
 Copy delivered on 24th August 1964.
 Number of words—163 only.

	Rs.	a.	p.
Copying Fee ..	0	6	0
Comparing Fee ..	0	0	6
Paper ..	0	2	0
	<u>0</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>6</u>

Prepared by
(Signed)

Compared by:
(Signed).

Municipal Borough,
Nipani.

(True Copy)

(Signed).....,
Chief Officer,
Municipal Borough, Nipani.

APPENDIX VII

(Vide paragraph 6.152)

**LETTER DATED 3RD MAY 1956, FROM THE CHIEF MINISTER OF
THE HYDERABAD STATE TO THE UNION HOME MINISTER**

My dear PANTJI,

You must have received my long letter in connection with the Resolution passed by the Hyderabad Assembly regarding the States Reorganisation Bill. You must have noticed that besides certain amendments in connection with other matters there are some specific amendments incorporating the territorial changes which have been agreed to by all parties representing all regions in the Assembly. While I am confident that all the amendments suggested by our Assembly will be given due consideration by the Select Committee, I wish to stress particularly the amendments suggested regarding territorial adjustments and regarding Bidar district.

2. As you are aware, the four Kannada taluqas of Bidar district were proposed originally by the Bill to be merged with Gulbarga district. It is the unanimous desire of the Kannadigas and others of the State that Bidar district should be retained as a separate unit and those taluqas should not be merged with Gulbarga as proposed in the Bill. There was complete unanimity in the Assembly regarding this matter. It was also suggested in the amended resolution that if the four taluqas are considered insufficient to constitute a district, necessary area from the adjoining area of Gulbarga may subsequently be added by the successor Government. I have had a talk regarding this matter, with Shri Hanumanthaiya and he has agreed that Bidar may be retained as a separate district. I think he will be writing to you shortly. As this is an important deviation from the original Bill, I hope you and the Select Committee will kindly accept it as it is based on the unanimous opinion of the people concerned.

3. The other territorial adjustments have been suggested unanimously by the Assembly in view of the fact that the people of those areas would have otherwise had to face practical difficulties. Small linguistic border areas are a source of trouble even for the administration and, as far as possible, they should be merged with the bigger neighbouring groups. That is why the representatives of all the three regions in the Assembly came to the unanimous conclusion that even if those areas are lesser than a *tahsil* or a *taluka* they should be added on to the respective linguistic groups. You will notice that the two taluqas of Adilabad district namely, Kinwat and Rajura, have been proposed to be added to Marathwada. The Telangana people agreed to this transfer also because the Marathwada agreed to the transfer of South Bastar and Sironcha taluqas to Telangana of Andhra area. These agreements are

based on factual data as well as on local feeling. Sironcha taluq is in Chanda district at present and South Bastar has been included in Madhya Pradesh. I hope it will be possible for you to accept these changes because they are fair and just to all concerned.

4. You will recollect that I had proposed the exchange of one Revenue Circle of Bidar district between Karnatak and Telangana. It is proposed that the Revenue Circle of Nayalkal in Bidar tahsil should be transferred to Zahirabad tahsil¹ in exchange for Nirona Revenue Circle of Zahirabad tahsil. This arrangement has been agreed to by all Karnatak, Telengana and Marathwada members unanimously. This exchange has been proposed not on linguistic basis, but because of the necessity of Devanur project situated in Telangana. This was appreciated by all and all have agreed for the exchange. Shri Hanumanthaiya also agreed yesterday when I had a discussion with him. It is very important that this Circle should be exchanged. I hope the Select Committee will accept the amendment.

5. I shall write to you again in regard to the transfer of 19 or 20 villages of Rajolibanda area in Raichur district. There was agreement regarding that, but as the area concerned was less than a Revenue Circle, we did not include it as an item for amendment. I am trying to get an agreement with Shri and the local people and we will put before you a joint proposal regarding that area. I hope it can be decided by the consent of the Government concerned and need not become a part of the Bill.

6. The other amendments are also, I think, very reasonable and do not involve any matter of principle or cause any major change in the Bill. I hope they will be considered sympathetically.

With kind regards,

Your sincerely,

(Signed) B. RAMAKRISHNA RAO

PANDIT G. B. PANT,
Home Minister, Government of India,
New Delhi.

Government Central Press, Bombay.

MEMORANDUM

ON

MAHARASHTRA-MYSORE
BORDER DISPUTE

TO

THE COMMISSION

ON

MAHARASHTRA—MYSORE—KERALA
BOUNDARY DISPUTES

1967

ON BEHALF OF
THE PEOPLE OF MAHARASHTRA

I. INTRODUCTORY

The States Reorganisation Commission submitted its report on the reorganisation of States in 1955 and the State of Bombay (Maharashtra) and the State of Mysore came into existence in 1956. Although the States were formed, the work of demarcating the boundaries between the above two States was left unfinished.

2. During the period of over ten years since then, not only the aggrieved Marathi-speaking people living on the border of the Mysore State and the former Bombay Government (Maharashtra) have been demanding the transfer of the contiguous and compact Marathi-majority areas but also the population of the entire State of Maharashtra has evinced keen interest in the well-being of the large segment of the Marathi-speaking people cut away from them by the States Reorganisation Act. This is evidenced by the number of questions raised in the State Legislative Assembly and the State Legislative Council, the two resolutions unanimously passed by both these Houses urging an early solution of the problem, a number of articles published in newspapers and periodicals in Maharashtra from time to time and the public meetings, morchas, demonstrations, etc. A notable feature of the widespread concern in this boundary dispute in Maharashtra is that notwithstanding their ideological differences, all the political parties in Maharashtra are united in making the demand for transfer of the Marathi-majority areas in Mysore to Maharashtra.

3. Consequently, when the Government of India announced the appointment of the Commission consisting of Shri Mehr Chand Mahajan, for solving the dispute, the various political parties in Maharashtra decided to place before the Commission the views of the people of Maharashtra with one voice. In a meeting of leaders of the various parties on 17th December 1966, a committee, consisting of Shri H. V. Pataskar as Chairman and Dr. D. R. Gadgil and Shri M. D. Bhat as members, was accordingly appointed to draft a memorandum in consultation with the leaders for submission to the Commission. In pursuance of this decision, we are submitting this memorandum.

4. Having regard to the fact that considerable literature has already been published on this subject, we have confined this memorandum to the two aspects mentioned in the Press Note issued by the Commission inviting written memoranda from those interested in the problem. The first is the fundamental basis of the reorganisation of States in India and the second is an elucidation of Maharashtra's case in the light of the fundamental basis. In pursuance of the decision taken in the meeting of the all party leaders referred to above, the representatives of the individual areas now in the Mysore State have been asked to submit to the Commission direct their memoranda bringing out the salient features of the problem peculiar to their own areas. We understand that the representatives of individual areas have already submitted their memoranda to the Commission accordingly.

5. We have not appended any maps as we have dealt with the two aspects mentioned above and

not entered into a discussion of the individual areas involved. Besides, a map showing the demarcation of boundaries is already included in the report of the representatives of the Maharashtra Government on the Four-Man Committee, a copy of which is sent along with this memorandum. It is also understood that large scale maps are being submitted by the Government of Maharashtra along with its memorandum.

CHAPTER II

APPROACH TO THE PROBLEM

6. Taking into consideration the fundamental basis of the reorganisation of States in India, the Government of India by their Resolution No. F. 38/13/66-SR, dated the 25th October 1966, has appointed the Commission to solve the existing border disputes between the States of Maharashtra and Mysore and Mysore and Kerala.

7. The Government of Maharashtra (Bombay) and the Marathi-speaking people in the disputed areas of the Mysore State have been representing to the Government of India from the time the problem cropped up owing to the formation of the States of Bombay (Maharashtra) and Mysore under the States Reorganisation Act, 1956, that the question of demarcation of the boundaries between the States of Bombay (Maharashtra) and Mysore should be settled early on rational and just principles.

8. The process of evolution generated by historical forces, first for achieving administrative convenience of the British Government and then for meeting the political aspirations of the Indian people, has been instrumental in bringing about the reorganisation of States in India.

The beginning of this process may be seen in the early years of this century, when in October 1905, the Province of Eastern Bengal and Assam was constituted by

a proclamation by the Governor General of India comprising the territories under the administrative control of the Chief Commissioner of Assam and certain districts forming part of the Bengal Division of the Presidency of Fort William. By the same proclamation, the Governor General declared that the district of Sambalpur (except the Chandrapur-Padampur Zamindari and the Phuljhar Zamindari) forming part of the Central Provinces was included in the Bengal Division of the Presidency of Fort William. Seven years later, the partition of Bengal was annulled and the new Province of Bengal, the Province of Bihar and Orissa and the Province of Assam were constituted by the Bengal, Bihar and Orissa, and Assam Laws Act, 1912.

Year 1912

9. The Montague Chelmsford Committee appointed to report on a scheme for reforms for India submitted its report in 1918. It laid the foundation for the progressive association of the people of India with the Government of the country. Such an association led them to concede that the business of Government in that case would be simplified if administrative units were made more homogeneous and the business of legislation in these units would be facilitated if it was conducted in the language of the people.

Year 1918

10. The Indian Statutory Commission in their report (1930) also expressed the view that the use of a common speech was a strong and rational basis for provincial individualism. They pointed out that if those who spoke the same language formed a compact and self-contained area, so situated and endowed as to be able to support its existence as a separate province,

Year 1930

Year 1931 there was no doubt that the use of a common speech was a strong and natural basis for provincial individualism. The O'Donnell Committee which was appointed by the Government of India in 1931 to examine and report on the administrative, financial and other consequences of setting up a separate administration for the Oriya-speaking people took language and wishes of the people as the two main factors into consideration for the purpose.

Year 1936 11. In 1936, Sind was taken out of the province of Bombay and formed into a separate Province under the provisions of the Government of India Act, 1935. The language was one of the important factors taken into consideration for separation of Sind from other territories of the Province of Bombay. In the same year, the Province of Orissa was created under the provisions of the same Act by joining together the Oriya-speaking areas of the Provinces of Bihar and Orissa, the Central Provinces and Madras. The boundaries of the Province of Orissa with the adjoining Provinces of Bihar, Central Provinces and Madras were fixed by the Government of India (Constitution of Orissa) Order in March 1936 on the basis of the boundaries not only of the existing districts but also of smaller units like talukas and zamindari estates.

Year 1948 12. After India became independent, the President of the Constituent Assembly of India appointed a Linguistic Provinces Commission in June 1948 to examine and report on the question of the formation of new Provinces of Andhra, Karnataka, Kerala and Maharashtra. The Commission submitted their Report in December 1948 and recommended that no new

Provinces out of those referred to them should be created for the present.

13. Accordingly no steps were taken by the Constituent Assembly of India for creation of the Provinces of Andhra, Karnataka, Kerala and Maharashtra and they were not included as separate States in the First Schedule to the Constitution of India.

14. The J. V. P. Committee appointed by the Indian National Congress, 1949, generally concurred with the views expressed by the Dar Commission. The Committee however admitted that if public sentiment was insistent and overwhelming it would have to submit to it subject to certain limitations in regard to the good of India as a whole. Year 1949

15. Two orders were issued by the Governor General of India on 25th January 1950, transferring enclaves from one Province to another. By one of these orders, certain enclaves were transferred from the Province of Bombay to the State of Hyderabad and *vice versa*. Generally speaking, the people of these enclaves spoke the same language as the language of the people of the areas to which they were transferred. Year 1950

16. The agitation for the formation of States on the linguistic basis which had started since 1918 continued in the South and it became acute in the area covered by the Telugu-speaking people of the then State of Madras. Shri Potti Sriramulu undertook fast unto death for the formation of the Telugu-speaking State of Andhra. After his death the Prime Minister of India made a statement in Parliament on

Year 1953

19th December 1952, that the Government of India had decided to establish an Andhra State consisting of the Telugu speaking areas out of the then State of Madras. In March 1953 the Prime Minister made an announcement in Parliament about the formation of the new State of Andhra. He stated that as it was desirable that the new State should be formed as early as possible, and the work of fixing the exact boundaries through a Boundary Commission might take considerable time, the new State should be formed on the basis of the boundaries of the existing districts except in the case of the Bellary district where the Telugu majority talukas of Arvi, Alur and Rayadrug should be included in the proposed State of Andhra and that a Boundary Commission or Commissions would be appointed some time after the establishment of the Andhra State to determine the exact boundaries of the State and to recommend such adjustments as might be considered necessary in regard to the boundaries of that State with the residuary State of Madras and the Mysore State. On 1st October 1953 the Andhra State came into existence in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the Andhra State Act, 1953.

17. After the State of Andhra Pradesh had been formed in 1953, the Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs, by the Resolution No. 53/69/53-Public, dated 29th December 1953, appointed a Commission to examine the whole question of reorganisation of the States of the Indian Union. The following extracts from the Government Resolution

mentioned above are reproduced so that the fundamental basis of the reorganisation of States in India could be understood in its proper perspective :

“ The greater development of political consciousness among the people and the growing importance of the great regional languages led gradually to demands for the formation of certain States on linguistic basis.”

“ The language and culture of an area have an undoubted importance as they represent a pattern of living which is common in that area.”

“ The whole question of the reorganisation of the States of the Indian Union should be carefully examined, objectively and dispassionately, so that the welfare of the people of each constituent unit, as well as of the nation as a whole is promoted.”

The States Reorganisation Commission have discussed the above points in Chapter I of Part II of their report.

18. There are several observations made by the States Reorganisation Commission in their report which go to show that linguistic affinity was considered by them as a vital factor for redistribution of States. If the report is studied carefully, it will be found that by and large, the reorganisation of the States had been recommended with a view to bringing the people speaking the same language together. This is evident from their recommendations in regard to the formation of the States of Karnataka and Kerala and the breaking of the Hyderabad State and attaching the predominantly Marathi speaking areas to the Bombay (Maharashtra) State, the predominantly

Kannada speaking areas to the Karanataka (Mysore) State and the predominantly Telugu speaking areas to the Andhra State. It is also clear from their report that it was on account of Bombay City that they did not recommend the breaking up of the Bombay State into the States of Maharashtra and Gujarat.

Year 1956

19. In this connection, it may be mentioned that the Government of India did not accept all the recommendations made by the States Reorganisation Commission. The late Shri G. B. Pant, Minister for Home Affairs, stated in Parliament on 26th April 1956 in the course of the debate on the States Reorganisation Bill as under :

“ We have attached considerable weight to the recommendations of the Commission and as the honourable Members may be remembering we had made every effort to keep the country to the extent it was possible in a receptive mood on the eve of the publication of the Report of the Commission. It was our endeavour that the recommendations might be received with sympathy and respect. But we could not abdicate our function. While we were throughout persuading the people to be prepared for a cordial reception of the recommendations, we had to take account of the public opinion and to see that the final decisions were made with the general approval of the people concerned and of the community at large. So certain changes had to be made. I would like those who were of the opinion that the proposals of the Commission should have been accepted as they were, to see whether the position to-day would have been better or worse if those recommendations had been bodily incorporated in Bill.”

20. The recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission in regard to the creation of Vidarbha

and Telangana as separate States and the transfer of Bellary district which had already been included in the Mysore State, to the State of Andhra were not accepted by the Government of India and Parliament. There were also other recommendations made by the States Reorganisation Commission which were not accepted by the Government of India and Parliament.

21. Broadly speaking the demarcation of the boundaries between the reorganised States recommended by the States Reorganisation Commission was made on the basis of the boundaries of the existing districts. There were, however, a few cases in which territorial adjustments were recommended on the basis of area smaller than that of a district. The States Reorganisation Act passed by Parliament on 31st August 1956 specifies the territories of the various States, which include transfer of territories comprising talukas or portions of talukas from one State to another.

22. No Boundary Commission was appointed by the Government of India to determine the boundaries between the States of Andhra Pradesh and Madras as had been indicated by the Prime Minister of India, in his speech in Parliament in March 1953, on the assumption that the border dispute between the States of Andhra Pradesh and Madras might be settled satisfactorily by negotiation. The boundary dispute was eventually referred to Shri H. V. Pataskar in December 1956 for his mediation and on the basis of his report, the Andhra Pradesh and Madras (Alteration of Boundaries) Act was passed by Parliament in

Year 1959

December 1959, transferring 318 villages from the State of Andhra Pradesh to the State of Madras and 151 villages from the State of Madras to the State of Andhra Pradesh. The principles on which the re-adjustment of the boundaries between the two States was made were (1) The boundary line should be continuous and isolated pockets should be avoided. (2) The village should be the unit for consideration. (3) Villages with over 50 per cent. Telugu speaking people should be incorporated in the Andhra State and villages with over 50 per cent. Tamil speaking people should be incorporated in the Madras State. (4) Due consideration should be given to geographical features such as hills, forests and rivers, as constituting natural boundaries between the two States and to economic features such as irrigation sources and their ayacuts being in the same State. It may be noted that uniform application of these principles to both Andhra and Madras has permanently settled this boundary dispute to the satisfaction of both the States.

23. In September 1959, the Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh (Transfer of Territories) Act was passed by Parliament under which certain areas from three villages in Bhensrorgarh tehsil of Chittore district were transferred from the State of Rajasthan to the State of Madhya Pradesh.

Year 1960

24. In April 1960, the Bombay Reorganisation Act was passed by Parliament bifurcating the Bombay State into the States of Maharashtra and Gujarat. Under this Act several villages from Umbergaon taluka of Thana district and Nawapur, Nandurbar and

Akkalkuwa talukas of West Khandesh district were transferred to the State of Gujarat.

25. In September 1962, the State of Nagaland Act was passed by Parliament under which the territories comprising the district of Kohima and the Tuensang Frontier division of the North-East Frontier Agency were transferred from the State of Assam to the State of Nagaland. Year 1962

26. In May 1962, the Prime Minister of India referred the dispute between the States of Bihar and Uttar Pradesh in regard to the boundaries of the districts of Shahabad (Bihar) and Ballia (Uttar Pradesh) and Saran (Bihar) and Ballia (Uttar Pradesh) which were varying from time to time according to the variations in the deep streams of the rivers Ganges and Ghaghra, to the arbitration of Shri C. M. Trivedi. On 16th October 1965, the Prime Minister of India accepted all the recommendations made by Shri C. M. Trivedi in his report (1964). In this case the issue for arbitration was to determine the boundaries between the above districts owing to the changing course of the rivers Ganges and Ghaghra. The number of villages involved in the dispute was 192. The Arbitrator made his recommendations primarily on the basis of the convenience and the wishes of the inhabitants of the villages concerned. Year 1965

27. In April 1966, the Government of India decided to reorganise the State of Punjab on linguistic basis so as to constitute from its territories two States, namely, Punjab and Haryana States after transferring to Himachal Pradesh such of the hill areas particularly Year 1966

of the Hindi Region of the State as were contiguous to that Union territory and had cultural and linguistic affinities with it. The Government of India therefore appointed a Commission to examine the existing boundary of the Hindi and Punjabi regions of the then State of Punjab and to recommend what adjustments, if any, were necessary in that boundary to secure the linguistic homogeneity of the proposed Punjab and Haryana States.

28. In September 1966, the Punjab Reorganisation Act was passed by Parliament by which the State of Haryana was formed. The adjustment of boundaries between the Punjab and Haryana States and the Union Territory of Chandigarh was made in such a way that in some cases even villages or portions of villages were transferred from the State of Punjab to the State of Haryana and the Union Territory of Chandigarh.

29. The foregoing recital of the history of this question reveals certain broad features to which attention may now be called. In the first instance, in the pre-Independence period the progress of transfer of power to Indians and towards democratisation was closely related to recognition of the need for the formation of unilingual Provinces. What was involved in the process was fully brought out in the formation of the Province of Orissa in 1936. Indian political parties were also fully committed to the formation of Provinces on a linguistic basis. This is evident from the Report of the Nehru Committee (1928). After Independence there was a temporary setback in the acceptance of this principle as it was apprehended that it might lead to encouragement of

forces of disintegration. This phase was represented by the Report of the Dar Commission and the Report of the J. V. P. Committee. The phase lasted for only a short time as basic political forces proved too strong for it. Beginning with the formation of the Andhra State in 1953 a series of steps had to be taken which led to a radical reorganisation of the States in India. Unfortunately, this reorganisation did not take place as the result of initial acceptance of a set of principles for the formation of States and for the delimitation of their boundaries which were then consistently applied ; rather it came about through a series of hesitant and halting decisions taken under pressure of circumstances. Consequently, it is not possible to find the fundamental basis of the reorganisation of States in India during the last fifteen years fully and adequately formulated in any one statement or document. This has been due to want of uniformity and thoroughness resulting from the attitude of hesitancy. The basis has, therefore, to be derived from the trends that can be seen in the successive pieces of legislation in this respect.

30. In discussing the characteristics of the fundamental basis from a chronological study of relevant legislation, two aspects deserve special attention. Firstly, the importance of the linguistic criterion and secondly, the unit of territory in relation to which the delimitation of the boundaries is made.

31. The progressive acceptance of the principle of homogeneity of language and culture as the almost sole criterion for the reorganization of States is fully evident from legislative history. Outside the Hindi-

speaking area, what has been achieved during the last fifteen years is not only the formation of unilingual States but also a single State for each such linguistic group. All considerations and proposals which went counter to this trend have been swept aside in the course of history. It is instructive to follow, in this regard, the fate of the recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission which deviated from these principles. The States Reorganisation Commission recommended the continued existence of Telangana, the constitution of a separate State for Vidarbha and the creation of a Bombay State specially constituted so as to avoid tackling the problem of Bombay City. It also opposed the partition, on a linguistic basis, of the Punjab. These were the main recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission deviating from the principles indicated above; in all other respects, in recommending the formation of States, the Commission strictly followed the linguistic principle. The recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission regarding Telangana and Vidarbha were not accepted by Parliament and they departed from the linguistic principle by creating a bilingual State of speakers of Marathi and Gujarati. This arrangement, however, proved short-lived and in 1960 the bilingual State of Bombay had to be split into linguistic States of Maharashtra and Gujarat. This further established the principle of the reorganisation of States so as to form single, unilingual States outside the Hindi-speaking area. In 1966, the linguistic principle was explicitly accepted in the formation of the new States created by the reorganisation of the Punjab. It can thus be stated without any fear of contradiction that the

fundamental basis of the reorganisation of States has been the formation of single, unilingual States.

32. As regards the unit of territory which may be adopted for fixing the boundaries of the reorganised States the earliest example is that of Orissa. The boundaries between the Province of Orissa and the Province of Madras were delimited in 1936. In this case the demarcation of the boundaries between the two Provinces was made in some areas on the basis of the village as the unit. When in 1953, the post-Independence reorganisation of States began with the creation of the State of Andhra Pradesh, although the initial legislation was based on district boundaries, this was accompanied by the announcement that a boundary Commission would in due course define the boundaries in detail. It was the States Reorganisation Commission that argued for adopting the district unit as the basis for delimitation and for not breaking it up. That the plea was without substance was proved by the actual recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission which kept to the district unit only in certain cases but in others adopted the taluka and in some cases even the sub-tehsil and the thana units. All area units, including the lowest revenue units have during the hundred years been subject to change and there is no evidence for holding that any such unit has developed any special organic administrative or economic unity of its own which will suffer because of a delimitation of the boundary by villages. This view is sustained by the course of events which have led Parliament to adopt lower and lower units in fixing boundaries in legislation during the last ten years.

33. Since 1956, three major Acts have been passed which contain provisions regarding fixation of boundaries between linguistic States. These are : (1) The Andhra Pradesh and Madras Act of 1959, (2) The Bombay Reorganisation Act of 1960 and (3) The Punjab Reorganisation Act of 1966. In each of these, the village has been adopted as the lowest unit for delimiting boundaries in one context or another. The entire demarcation of the boundary between the Andhra and Madras States was carried out with the help of village census slips. The work was done so thoroughly and carefully that it left no residue of grievance or dispute.

The Bombay Reorganisation Act of 1960 involved the drawing up of the boundaries between the two new linguistic States of Gujarat and Maharashtra. The border districts involved were mainly Thana and West Khandesh in Maharashtra and Surat and Broach in Gujarat. The Act defined the boundary between the two new States by naming villages in each of the border talukas in the Thana and West Khandesh districts and adding them to the relevant border talukas in the Surat and Broach districts. The adjustment of the boundaries between the newly created States of the Punjab and Haryana and those between these two and Himachal Pradesh was entrusted to a Commission which were directed to ensure ordinarily that the adjustments did not involve the breaking of existing tehsils. Even so, the Commission found it necessary to go down to much lower units in each case. This is clearly brought out in the schedules to the Punjab Reorganisation Act, 1966. In the adjustment of the boundaries between the Punjab and Haryana States the lowest unit referred

to is that of the Patwari circle ; as between the Punjab State and Chandigarh the definition of boundaries is made often in terms of villages, and this is also the case regarding the adjustment of the boundary between the Punjab State and Himachal Pradesh.

34. It is thus clear that any unit above the village does not provide a generally satisfactory basis for the adjustment of the boundaries between reorganised States. There appears no justification for insisting on maintaining a larger unit intact in this delimitation. None of these have any significance in administrative, political or economic terms and the proper definition of boundaries ought not to be sacrificed for the supposed 'integrity' of these units. In the context of the particular border dispute between the Mysore and Maharashtra States the concept of a larger integrated unit is particularly irrelevant. The Government and people of Maharashtra have always insisted on the adoption of the village unit for the purpose. Though the definition of the Mysore position is not equally explicit or clear, the insistence of the Mysore Government on considering only minor adjustments within a limited border area leads to the same conclusion. Minor adjustments within a limited area have perforce to be defined in terms of individual villages.

35. In any border area for the purpose of demarcation of boundaries, the data necessary would be the number and proportion of the people who speak the two languages within the linguistic regions between which the boundary is to be settled ; so that when the people who speak other languages are found in the border territories their numbers would not be taken

into account either way in the process of fixing the boundary. The boundaries, after the mapping out of the disputed area should be drawn in consonance with the following principles :—

- (1) Contiguity of territory.
- (2) Village as the unit.
- (3) Relative majority between the two main linguistic groups.
- (4) wishes of the people.

36. The first principle requires that the boundary should be contiguous and unbroken. It implies that no islands or corridors should be allowed.

37. The second principle lays down that the unit for demarcation should be the village. It is found that it yields the best results. It helps to reduce the number of the Marathi-speaking people in the disputed area of the Mysore State and of the Kannada-speaking people in the disputed area of the Maharashtra State to the minimum.

38. The third principle propounds that the relative majority between the Marathi-speaking people and the Kannada-speaking people in the village should determine whether the village should be transferred to the Maharashtra State or should remain in the Mysore State and *vice versa*. There is no need or justification for prescribing any fixed percentage as it will necessarily be arbitrary. As the main object of readjusting the boundaries between the two States is to remove hardships and inconveniences of the maximum number of people, relative majority of one linguistic group over the other should be sufficient.

39. The fourth principle needs no explanation.

We feel that the application of the above four principles will carry out the reorganisation of the States of Maharashtra and Mysore to its logical conclusion.

40. Finally there are the factors which are advanced for modifying the operation of the linguistic principle. These are the unity and security of India and financial, economic and administrative considerations. It is obvious that considerations of security and finance do not arise in the present case. Linguistic reorganisation of even border States has not been held to affect security. The satisfactory resolution of a border dispute between the two States of Maharashtra and Mysore would positively promote the unity and strengthen the security of India. Considerations of finance are important only in relation to the size of States and this is not affected by such adjustment of boundaries as would result from the present reference. Inasmuch as the present question relates to determination of the boundary between two large and viable States, the economic and administrative factors would have no significant bearing. Besides, the States of Mysore and Maharashtra have been in existence for some years and any adjustment of the boundary between the two States at this stage is not going to affect them or the areas which would be transferred from one State to the other adversely.

41. The States Reorganisation Commission recommended the transfer of certain territory from Bihar to Bengal. Among the main reasons mentioned for this transfer were : (1) facilitating traffic between north and south of West Bengal and (2) enabling West Bengal to

acquire control of the Indo-Pakistan border along its entire length. These were very strong administrative reasons as they pertained to making the administration of a State which had been badly cut up by partition much easier.

42. The two main instances of modification of boundaries because of economic reasons relate both to the requirements of the construction of a big dam. An area was transferred from Rajasthan to Madhya Pradesh by the Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh Act, 1959, "in the interest of proper and smooth execution", of the Gandhi Sagar Dam on the river Chambal, the construction cost of which and the benefits flowing from which were shared equally by both the States. Similarly, certain villages were transferred from the West Khandesh district of Maharashtra to Gujarat at the time of the Bombay Reorganisation Act, 1960 in order to facilitate construction etc. of the Ukai project in the Surat district.

43. Barring such very important administrative and economic considerations no other factors have been allowed to affect the proper delimitation of linguistic boundaries. The position of cities, towns and market areas on the border has in no case been allowed to justify deviation from the strict linguistic boundary. No consideration of the important types indicated above occurs in the case of the Mysore-Maharashtra border. Therefore, its demarcation ought to be made strictly according to the principles indicated by us above.

CHAPTER III

EXPOSITION OF THE BOUNDARY DISPUTE

44. It has been argued in the previous chapter that the fundamental basis of the reorganisation of States in India brought out by the course of legislation since 1953 has been homogeneity of language and culture ; and that the objective attained by the entire process of reorganisation outside the Hindi speaking area has been the creation of unilingual single States of each language. It has further been pointed out that wherever the work of the determination of boundaries was undertaken and carefully carried out, it was found necessary to reach down to the revenue village as the lowest unit involved in the demarcation. Lastly, it has been shown by reference to legislative history that only a few overwhelmingly important administrative or economic considerations have been allowed to modify the boundary drawn on strict linguistic considerations. It remains to indicate briefly what results the application of the principles mentioned earlier will yield in the existing border dispute between Mysore and Maharashtra.

45. In the first instance, it needs to be emphasised that the dispute is between two States formed on the linguistic basis. The linguistic basis has been insisted upon constantly and consistently by the people of Maharashtra throughout the many stages previous to the constitution of the present State of Maharashtra. Equally, since the time of the 1928 Nehru Committee, the demand of the leaders and people of Karnatak

has been for the formation of a unilingual single State of the speakers of Kannad. It may happen that in particular contexts for particular purposes they may attempt to play down the linguistic factor. However, when this happens, it needs to be remembered that not only in the earlier stage before the formation of the single linguistic State but even after, when arguing about particular border areas such as Bellary before 1956 or about Kasargode as under the present reference, their reliance on the linguistic principle is fully in evidence.

46. The second point to be noted about the existing dispute is that the disputed border has never yet been carefully demarcated. It was reached as the result of a set of purely *ad hoc* decisions. The recommendations of the State Reorganisation Commission were based on a series of obviously contradictory considerations and arguments such as the integrated district unit, importance of district towns and making package deals by a process of, what was called, in case of Bellary by the Mysore Government, a barter-like arrangement. The district unit was never really accepted ; Parliament by accepting Mr. Justice Misra's recommendation on Bellary has overruled the argument regarding district towns and the same decision has upset the basis of the barter arrangement. It is arguable that the State Reorganisation Commission was so overwhelmed by the magnitude and complexity of its task that it could not produce a consistent, detailed and careful solution to each problem that it faced. Accepting this contention it then becomes necessary that the instances in which its solution was not clear,

consistent or just must be looked into and dealt with appropriately later. It follows that where the present boundary represents decisions reached in an *ad hoc* manner without detailed scrutiny or application of consistent principles, there can be no presumption that the existing situation is, in any particular, proper or just. We would, therefore, urge strongly upon the Commission to examine carefully the whole of the disputed border area, bearing in mind that the work has not at all been done properly before and that, therefore, there is no presumption in favour of the *status quo*.

47. The above would make clear the nature of the existing border dispute. The fundamental basis of reorganization of States in India requires the formation of single unilingual States. Certain criteria have been evolved during the process of reorganization regarding the constitution and fixation of boundaries of such States. When these criteria are methodically applied, the new States can be said to be properly formed; where this is not done and *ad hoc* decisions are taken, territory and population that should properly be included in the State are put in another and this naturally leads to a dispute. Maharashtra claims that a considerable portion of territory on the border, now included in Mysore, is properly speaking a part of Maharashtra; similarly, some territory which should be a part of Mysore is now included in Maharashtra. It is necessary to correct this maldistribution and draw the boundary carefully. It is thus wrong to suggest that Maharashtra claims any part of Mysore or that people in the disputed territory are contumacious. If decisions have been taken improperly or in a hurry, in the past, and

have led to mistakes in the constitution or formation of the reorganised States, the States and the people suffering as a result of the mistakes have every right to demand that the mistakes be corrected, the boundaries be redrawn and the territory and people in question be allotted to the State to which they properly belong.

48. Before going on to consider some points of detail regarding the disputed border, we may deal with two or three general considerations that have been raised in representations from Mysore. A number of arguments from history have been drawn upon in these representations. We would urge that, in this matter, it is necessary to proceed strictly on the basis of the situation in 1956, *i.e.* at the time of the constitution of the State of Mysore. Historical considerations could cut both ways and are essentially irrelevant to this border dispute. Whether a ruler or conqueror belonging to one or the other linguistic group occupied some territory in the past or not has, in our opinion, no relevance to reorganisation of States in a democratic republic. What is relevant in this case is only the then existing composition of the population of a territory or area and the wishes of the concerned people.

49. Arguments have also been put forward relating to administrative convenience or to flow of economic activity. In a sense, the reorganisation of States on the linguistic basis is itself justified on grounds of administrative convenience. That the language of the people of an area should be the language of their

administration is the first essential of administrative propriety, convenience and efficiency. Other grounds such as nearness of a town or the length of a route are extremely unimportant as compared with the importance of the language of administration. Therefore, no ground of convenience of any administration can be held to deny to the people of any territory which properly belongs to a reorganised linguistic State, their right to be included in that State. Considerations of flow of economic activity are similarly irrelevant to the border dispute. Moreover, as has been pointed out above, no factors of such administrative convenience or economic relations have been allowed to modify boundaries drawn on the strict linguistic principle in all measures of demarcation undertaken during the last ten years. It has to be noted that while administrative arrangements can be altered fairly easily, and flows of trade and economic activity are liable to change from time to time, the fixation of boundaries of linguistic States will determine the shape and content of the life of the people, linguistic and cultural as well as economic and political, for generations to come. The latter is, therefore, of fundamental and lasting importance; and this leads each small group to be intensely concerned about the decision which is to determine its future.

50. The border dispute between Maharashtra and Mysore is a peculiar one. Marathi and Kannada belong to two distinct language families, the Indo-Aryan and the Dravidian respectively, and the acquisition and use of Kannada for speakers of Marathi is not easy. More-

over, for at least more than a century this area has been included in a province in which the majority was of the speakers of Marathi. Therefore, the inclusion of this part of Maharashtra in a State formed for the speakers of Kannada brought about a sudden and cataclysmic change in the situation of the speakers of Marathi to which their reactions were understandably strong. It was natural for them to express in every possible way their great resentment at being deprived, arbitrarily and without proper enquiry or consultation, of their right to share in the cultural and linguistic life of the State of Maharashtra. Their sentiments and activities evoked sympathetic response in the rest of Maharashtra ; this is the genesis of the continuing border dispute ever since the reorganization of 1956.

51. It is not necessary for us to enter into the details of the dispute ; this has already been done carefully and thoroughly in the report of the representatives of the Government of Maharashtra on the Maharashtra-Mysore Boundary Dispute Committee. All that has happened since the year of the report, *i.e.* 1962, strengthens the stand taken and the exposition made by these representatives in the report. We request that the border should be adjusted in the manner recommended in that report.

PRINTED AT THE GOVERNMENT CENTRAL PRESS, BOMBAY

MEMORANDUM

ON

MAHARASHTRA-MYSORE
BORDER DISPUTE

TO

THE COMMISSION

ON

MAHARASHTRA—MYSORE—KERALA
BOUNDARY DISPUTES

1967

MAHARASHTRA EKIKARAN SAMITI
BELGAUM

**MEMORANDUM ON MAHARASHTRA-MYSORE
BORDER DISPUTE**

Dated 26th February 1967

From

Shri B. R. SUNTHANKAR,
President, Maharashtra Ekikaran Samiti,
Belgaum.

To

THE SECRETARY,
Maharashtra-Mysore-Kerala Boundary
Commission,
Secretariat, New Delhi-1.

Sir,

I append hereto a Memorandum for submission to the Commission appointed by the Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs, Resolution No. F. 38/13/66-SR, dated 25th October, 1966, as called for by the Commission by its notification of 15th December, 1966.

The said Memorandum is submitted on behalf of the Maharashtra Ekikaran Samiti, Belgaum.

Yours faithfully,

B. R. SUNTHANKAR,
President,
Maharashtra Ekikaran Samiti, Belgaum.

MEMORANDUM

Following Memorandum is humbly submitted on behalf of the Maharashtra Ekikaran Samiti, Belgaum, to the Commission appointed by the Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs Resolution, dated the 25th October, 1966, by their Notification No. F. 38/13/66-SR of even date.

2. *Samiti, the most representative body of the area in dispute before the Commission, and works independently of any of the recognised political parties of the country.*—The Maharashtra Ekikaran Samiti, which will be referred to hereinafter briefly as the Samiti, is the most representative body of the Marathi-speaking people of the area of the Mysore State which is the subject-matter of the dispute before the Commission. It will suffice to establish the Samiti's representative character by pointing out that it set up its own candidates in all the five Mysore Legislative Assembly constituencies which were comprised in the said area in the 1957 and 1962 General Elections and these candidates won the election by overwhelming majorities solely on the border issue against their powerful Congress rivals, who opposed any change in the *status quo*. Therefore, even at the outset it should be clear that the present Memorandum represents the wishes of the people of the said area.

3. The Samiti was formed in 1946 with the sole object of integrating the Marathi-speaking areas of the

districts of Belgaum and North Kanara with Maharashtra. It has all along been working only for the unification of Maharashtra and the advance of the Marathi language and Maharashtrian culture. The Samiti never affiliated itself to any political party uptil now. After the appointment of the States Reorganisation Commission, all the Marathi-speaking people of the area in question suspended for the time being all their other political activities and rallied round the banner of the Samiti and helped submitting a unanimous memorandum to that Commission. When the demand of the Samiti was rejected by the S. R. C., the unity of the people was strengthened even more and the Samiti is thus functioning in concert till this day. This Memorandum is thus the expression of the opinion of all the Marathi speakers in the area in question irrespective of their political affiliations. The Samiti knows from its past experience that it cannot depend on any known political party. The people living in the said area and the Samiti as its most representative body are more concerned with the question before the present Commission than any recognised political party and than even any State Government. It, therefore, requests the Commission with all earnestness to examine the present Memorandum and every part of it with as great a care as possible.

4. *Present Memorandum restricted to area in dispute in only one District, namely, Belgaum.*—We propose to restrict ourselves in this Memorandum to the area of the Belgaum District only. [A separate memorandum is being submitted by the Samiti branch at Karwar.

There are also special memoranda by the Samiti branches for (1) the Nipani area, (2) the Khanapur Taluka, (3) the Belgaum Taluka and (4) Mangsuli area in Athani Taluka.] The said area stretches along the entire border between the States of Maharashtra and Mysore. Briefly it comprises—

- (i) the present Belgaum Taluka including the Belgaum Town and excluding some portion of the Taluka to the East,
- (ii) most of the Khanapur Taluka, only a small eastern portion of that Taluka being excluded from it,
- (iii) about one-third of the Chikodi Taluka, being the western portion thereof,
- (iv) small areas in the north-west and south-west of the Hukkeri Taluka,
- (v) small areas to the western side of the Athani Taluka.

(Annexure 'A' to this memorandum is a map which gives the disputed areas in three districts, viz., Belgaum, Karwar and Bidar. The areas detailed above from the Belgaum District are also shown separately in maps of the five Talukas. Annexure 'B' gives the population figures for the area claimed by the Samiti.)

The following table gives the population figures according to the 1951 census for the various areas described above:

TABLE

			Percentage of Marathi- speaking people	Percentage of Kannad- speaking people
1. Belgaum District before 1956	26·6	64·3
2. Belgaum District after 1956	23·4	67·2
3. Total disputed area in District	68·1	22·4
4. Belgaum Town	53·4	24·9
5. Area claimed by Samiti in Belgaum Taluka (including Belgaum Town).			59·6	24·3
6. Area claimed by Samiti in Khanapur Taluka	..		76·9	11·9
7. Area claimed by Samiti in Chikodi Taluka	..		72·1	19·5
8. Area claimed by Samiti in Hukkeri Taluka	..		71·4	24·2
9. Area claimed by Samiti in Athani Taluka	..		60·6	32·5

5. *The principle to be applied in determining the present case.*—The said area is a contiguous area with a length of about 100 miles North-South and a maximum width of about 50 miles East-West. It lies between the purely Marathi-speaking area to its west and the Kannad-speaking area to its east. It is thus contiguous to both Marathi-speaking and Kannad-speaking areas. It is a border area. As the border area it contains both Marathi-speaking and Kannad-speaking people. The question at issue is whether it should be joined to the Marathi-speaking State of Maharashtra or be retained in the Kannad-speaking State of Mysore. A question like this would naturally arise where it is intended to form States on the linguistic basis. Forgetting mere slogans like the expressions “Karnatak” or “Maharashtra” and using the simplest possible words, the linguistic principle means that it is good for the progress of the

country as a whole that people using the same language should associate together as a State. In a border area as referred to above, there will be two languages used by the people. *Prima facie* a border area should be joined to that group which speaks the same language as the language of the majority in that area. Where the difference in the number of peoples speaking the two languages is large enough, there should be little difficulty in determining to which State the border area should go. It is found that the population of the disputed area in both the districts of Belgaum and Karwar is about 5·50 lakhs and of that in the Belgaum district alone is about 4·60 lakhs. The linguistic division in the above populations is 71·6 per cent Marathi-speaking and 18·7 per cent Kannad-speaking for both the districts together and about 69·4 per cent Marathi-speaking and about 21·4 per cent Kannad-speaking for Belgaum district alone. The Marathi-speaking population in both the said cases is thus in an overwhelming majority. There ought to be therefore, no difficulty in joining it to the Marathi-speaking State of Maharashtra. The contention sometimes made that the percentage of the Marathi-speaking people in the border area should have been higher, if that area is to be joined to Maharashtra, has no substance in it.

6. *The Kannad case.*—The objection made to the above procedure by the Kannad-speaking people can be summarised under the following heads:

(1) The slogan “Karnatak”.

- (2) A district or a Taluka should not be split up for the purpose of reorganisation. Such a splitting up is administratively not convenient.
- (3) Economic affiliations i.e., Trade and Commerce.
- (4) Culture.

7. *A brief answer to the Kannad case.*—A detailed consideration of the above objections will be found later in this Memorandum. At this stage, only a brief answer is necessary, and is as follows:

It is clear to us that the slogan of “Karnatak” has little relevancy to the question at issue. It does not call here for an enquiry into what was the name given to any region a thousand or a five hundred years ago or in what part of country in old times the area now in question was included. There are many old names denoting regions in this country, like Karnatak, Magadh, Kalinga, Kuntal, Lat and Kosal. These names have no significance for the purposes of the present issue. The splitting up of a district or a Taluka is contended to be administratively inconvenient. It is yet clear that that contention has little meaning where the district or taluk is the result of historical processes and was created by the British for their own convenience and irrespective of any consideration of language or culture or trade or commerce. The States Reorganization Commission has not itself rigourously observed the principle of the inviolability of a district or taluk and the boundary between Andhra and Madras or

between Punjab and Hariana has actually been settled only by splitting up districts and talukas. As regards the third objection there is abundant proof to establish that the traditional and actual trade links of the area described in paragraph 4 above are with the coastal belt to the West and the Maharashtra area to the North. Culturally also the Marathi-speaking people of the said area must be held to have greater affinity with the people of the Maharashtra State than with the Kannad-speaking people whose leading communities are the Lingayats and the Vakkaligas. Both culturally and economically, the people of this border area ought to know their links and affinities better than anybody else, including even the two Governments of Mysore and Maharashtra, and the Samiti is the sole representative body of the Marathi-speaking people of the said area.

8. *A few developments since S. R. Act, 1956.*—

A brief reference may be made here to some developments between the passing of the S. R. Act, 1956 and the appointment of the present Commission. Section 21 of the said Act made provision for a solution of border disputes through Zonal Councils, and the border dispute now under consideration was taken up by the Western Zonal Council, of which both the States concerned, namely Bombay and Mysore were members. Before however any progress could be made in that Council, there started the question of the reorganisation of the Bombay State, and in 1959 that State was split into the two linguistic States of Maharashtra and Gujarath.

The Maharashtra State which now became concerned with the present border dispute, was however no longer a member of the same Zonal Council as Mysore. The two States yet in 1960 appointed a Committee, consisting of two representatives of each, to consider the question. The representatives of Mysore differed from those of Maharashtra, and each group made its own separate report to the State which had appointed it. Finally has come the present appointment of a One-Man-Commission by the Central Government. It will thus be seen that the present Commission is appointed to complete a work which was left unfinished by the S. R. Act, 1956. Mysore and Maharashtra have also declared Kannad and Marathi as their respective official languages. All civil and judicial administration is carried accordingly, and that is a development which further affects the present border area, and is relevant for the purposes of the Commission.

9. *Commission will have to make recommendations in accordance with the fundamental basis of the Reorganisation of States.*—This work of the border dispute is assigned to this Commission by the Government Resolution dated 25th October 1966. In view of the wording of that Resolution the Commission will have to make its recommendations in accordance with the fundamental basis of the Reorganisation of States. The relevant portion of the Government Resolution is reproduced below :

“ Taking into consideration the fundamental basis of the Reorganisation of States in India and with a view to solving the existing border disputes

between the States of Maharashtra and Mysore and Kerala, the Government of India hereby appoint a Commission consisting of Shri Meher Chand Mahajan, former Chief Justice of India, which shall hear the concerned parties and make its recommendations.”

It is, therefore, necessary first to have a clear idea of what such fundamental basis means.

10. *Language evidently the fundamental basis of the various Reorganisation Acts.*—The following Parliamentary Acts provide for the Reorganisation of States in India: (1) The Andhra Act, 1953, read with the Andhra Pradesh and Madras (alteration of Boundaries) Act, 1959, (2) The States Reorganisation Act, 1956, (3) The Bombay Reorganisation Act, 1959 and (4) The Punjab Reorganisation Act, 1966. There can be little doubt that the main object, or the fundamental basis of all these Acts is to secure a division of the country into States on linguistic basis. “The Statement of Objects and Reasons” in the Bill for the first of the said Acts thus expressly refers to the Government decision “to establish an Andhra State consisting of the Telugu speaking areas of the present Madras State”. The linguistic basis is similarly expressly referred to in the Statement of Objects and Reasons attached to the Bill for the Punjab Act. The linguistic basis when applied to the whole country had necessarily to take into account the security of the country and the financial and administrative implications. But these other matters cannot be

described as the “ Fundamental Basis ” of the Acts mentioned above for Re-organisation of States.

11. *Evolution of the linguistic principle before the said Acts.*—It will be in fitness of things to trace here briefly the evolution of the principle of linguistic Provinces or States. In the early times of the British, there was no principle and no reason or rhyme in the formation of provinces, which were only a patch work of annexed territories. Later on the British felt the necessity of re-organising the provinces on the basis of some principle. They thus formed the North-West Frontier Province, Assam, Bihar, Sindh and Orissa and accepted language as the basis. “ The Montford Report and the Simon Report are all one in condemning the existing provinces and in advocating their reformation on a linguistic basis ”. (Dar Commission’s Report, paragraph 6). The Indian National Congress discarded the British Administrative Provinces for its work and created its own provinces on linguistic basis. This very basis was advocated by the Nehru Committee Report in 1928. The Indian National Congress from time to time passed resolutions urging for linguistic provinces. Mahatma Gandhi has endorsed the linguistic principle for the formation of provinces and also the demarcating of their boundaries. We quote below his own words—
 “ The issue put forth in them is that all the Hindi-speaking areas should form one province and all the Marathi-speaking areas should be integrated into one province. So far as I am concerned, I fully sympathise with the suggestion. I have full faith in accepting the principle of language for demarcating the

boundaries of such provinces”. (Reply to the letter of Shri G. T. Madkholkar dated 7th April 1942 appearing in Marathi ‘ Harijan ’ dated 19th April 1942). Late Shri Jawaharlal Nehru as Prime Minister of India, accepted on behalf of the Government in the Constituent Assembly. The Dar Commission did not discard the linguistic principle, but recommended that the time was not ripe and the circumstances did not permit then to put it into practice. The J. V. P. Committee went a step forward and recommended the formation of Andhra province on the linguistic basis and the postponement of the question of other provinces viz., Karnatak, Keral and Maharashtra. That was in 1949. The various Reorganisation Acts referred to above have followed thereafter.

12. *Resolution of 29th December 1953 appointing the States Reorganisation Commission, considered, showing further that language alone is the determining factor for the present Commission.*—The two Andhra Acts, the Bombay Reorganisation Act and the Punjab Reorganisation Act provide specific instances of the application of the linguistic principle. Nothing more needs to be said about them. The States Reorganisation Act is however broader and the more comprehensive Act. An examination of the Government Resolution of 29th December 1953 which appointed the States Reorganisation Commission is therefore calculated to afford some evidence as to the true jurisdiction and function of the present Commission. The said Resolution begins by saying that the States as they existed at that time “are largely the result of historical processes and the spread and consolidation

of the British power in India ”. It states categorically that “ the Pattern of States in the Union is thus the result of historical accident and circumstances ”. It then goes on to state as follows :

“ The greater development of political consciousness among the people and the growing importance of the great regional languages led gradually to demands for the formation of certain States on linguistic basis. Each such separate problem was however closely inter-related with other problems and any formation of a new State necessarily affected a number of other States. It thus became increasingly difficult to consider any such problem in isolation.”

It is, therefore, clear that it was the development of regional languages which led to the demand of formation of certain States on linguistic basis.

Paragraph 4 of the said resolution is important and may be usefully reproduced in full :

“ The language and culture of an area have an undoubted importance as they represent a pattern of living which is common in that area. In considering a reorganisation of States, however, there are other important factors which have also to be borne in mind. The first essential consideration is the preservation and strengthening of the unity and security of India. Financial, economic and Administrative considerations are almost equally important, not only from the point of view of each State, but for the whole nation. India has embarked upon a great ordered plan for her economic, cultural and moral progress. Changes which interfere with

the successful prosecution of such a national plan would be harmful to the National interest.”

It will be seen that the main consideration is “ the language and culture of an area ”. The other factors which come in, like the Unity and Security of India and the financial, economic and administrative considerations, are no doubt important factors, but it is clear from the resolution itself that they come in secondarily. They are all subordinate to the main object of Re-organisation which is “ the language and culture of an area ”.

Not only do the said other factors come in secondarily in the resolution of 29th December 1953, but they are not even referred to in the resolution of 25th October 1966 ; the second resolution mentions only the “ fundamental basis ”, and it is thus clear that the jurisdiction and function of the present commission is limited to the language consideration.

13. *Next question is to examine S. R. C. Report.*— It will now be necessary to examine how the S. R. Commission, not-with-standing the considerations already referred to, cause to include the sizeable Marathi speaking tract which is now in question in the State of Mysore and not in the State of Maharashtra. There was no question here of “ the unity and security of India ”, but how the Commission approached the question of “ financial, economic and administrative consideration ” will have to be examined. The culture aspect as referred to in the Resolution was not examined by the S. R. C. but that too will be examined in this Memorandum.

14. *Dar Commission & J. V. P. Committee's report stated briefly.*—There were three bodies which investigated the subject of reorganisation of States, namely, The Dar Commission, The J. V. P. Committee and the S. R. Commission. Before we consider the last named body, it would be useful to see what view the first two have taken so far as the border dispute is concerned. The Dar Commission in paragraphs 43 and 46 states :

“ The present home land of the Kannad language is Mysore State and the Union Districts of Dharwar and Bijapur, where it is spoken by 70 per cent to 80 per cent of the people. But Kannad is also the majority language of two other Bombay Districts viz. North Kanara and Belgaum and of one Madras district, viz., Bellary where it is the language of 54·9, 64·6 and 55·4 per cent of the people respectively The districts of North Kanara and Belgaum contain strong Maharashtrian minorities.”

It will be seen that the Belgaum and North Kanara (i.e. Karwar) districts are not referred to above as the “ Home land ” of the Kannad language.

The J. V. P. Committee's view was that the old congress policy of having linguistic provinces could be applied only after careful thought in each separate case but a beginning could be made with the creation of Andhra. So far as Belgaum district is concerned the report of the Committee does not therefore add anything material. The report does not anywhere refer to the Belgaum district and to the special conditions prevailing there.

15. *S. R. C. Report examined.*—Now we have to consider the all important Report in 1955 of State Re-organisation Commission. This report in relation to questions which arise about the Belgaum District suffers from the defect stated by the Commission itself in paragraph 9 as follows :—

“ The Census figures for 1951 have been compiled according to what are known as ‘ Census Tracts ’. It has, therefore, been difficult to estimate the mother tongue figures on a Taluk or Tahsilwise basis. We were given to understand that it might be possible to make estimates of Taluka or Tahasilwise figures on the basis of certain statistical assumptions. Having regard, however, to the controversies which surround such assumptions, we took into consideration only the figures as printed in different census reports in reaching our conclusions.”

16. In the opinion of the Samiti the above procedure of the S. R. C. as recorded by itself, vitiates its report in regard to the district of Belgaum. Whatever anxiety there may have been on that Commission's part not to split a District, in actual fact it has not only split districts, but even recommended splitting of Talukas. A mere general opinion about any undesirability has no value, if it is not actually applied in practice. Even in regard to the district of Belgaum, the Commission singled out the Chandgad Taluka of Belgaum district for exclusion from the proposed Karnatak State. The Commissions observations in paragraph 347 of its report ought to be reproduced here in full:

“ 347. The Chandgad Taluk of Belgaum District is predominantly Marathi-speaking and it has been

established as a result of resorting of census slips that the Marathi majority in the Taluk is as high as 92·4 per cent. It can be conveniently administered by the State of Bombay and Karnatak should have no objection to this proposal.”

17. The Commission therefore did look into the resorted census slips when it liked in spite of its clear statement in paragraph 9 of the report not to take into consideration any but the original figures as printed in the different census reports. There is a language hand-book published by the Superintendent of the Census Operations with a preface which is dated 19th October 1955. This hand-book contains figures after the sorting of census slips and the percentage of 92·4 for the Chandgad Taluka is taken by the Commission from the information furnished to it and published in the Language Hand-Book.

18. In paragraph 348 of its Report, the Commission has not specifically expressed any aversion to the splitting of a Taluka though what it has done is to consider Talukas as a whole. In regard to Belgaum and Khanapur Talukas, it observes that the Marathi speaking majorities are slight and its decision to include them in the proposed Karnatak State is based on economic affiliations. The merits of these observations will be considered presently. For the present it is to be pointed out that the Commission tries to explain away the majorities of the Marathi speaking population in the Belgaum and Khanapur Talukas as “slight” and rests its decisions on “economic affiliations”. In regard to Chikodi Taluka it observes that “the Kannadigas constitute the largest single language

group ”. The language employed here is not quite the same as that employed in relation to Belgaum and Khanapur Talukas. In any case the main contention of the Samiti in regard to the Marathi-speaking part of this Taluka has been completely ignored.

19. The said paragraph 348 of the S. R. C. Report will have to be considered further in detail. But even before that is done, the Samiti is compelled to say that there were certain pressures at work and that the Commission was misguided and misinformed by interested persons. It may be pointed out that at that time the Bombay State was a tri-lingual State—Gujarati, Marathi and Kannad and its Chief Minister was Shri Morarji Desai. The balance of power could be maintained only by the Gujarat and Kannad groups joining together as against the Maharashtra group. This position, it is submitted, is so obvious that it should not require any proof and no attempt is therefore made to cite instances. It may however be pointed out that after the S. R. C. Report was submitted to the Government there was the question about the City of Bombay and the Karnatak Provincial Congress Committee passed a Resolution on 2nd November 1955 which states as follows: “In view of peculiar circumstances in Bombay, the retention of Bombay State as recommended by S. R. C. seems to be inevitable. In case this is not found possible, Bombay City should be kept separate.” The Karnatak Provincial Congress Committee had no direct concern with the question of the City of Bombay and its resolution has to be interpreted only as one intended to support the Gujarath view. As stated already the Samiti is not

affiliated to any political party and it is also clear that the then Government of Bombay has not supported any claims of the Samiti. It is also widely believed that the first draft of the Commission's report was in favour of certain claims made by the Samiti. There were newspaper reports to that effect (*vide* Annexure 'C'). Under what circumstances the Commission's report came out afterwards in its present shape is not known to the Samiti. The Samiti however cannot help recording the belief referred to above.

20. The question of Belgaum District, excluding Chandgad Taluka, is considered by S. R. C. in paragraphs 348 and 349 of its report. These two paragraphs contain so many mis-statements and misleading statements that one is almost surprised that they should come from such an experienced and authoritative body. It is stated that "the Belgaum town is the centre of transit trade in this area, which is chiefly in cotton and oil seeds". This is a complete mis-statement and admitted to be so by Mysore Government (*see* paragraph 39 of the booklet "Maharashtra and Mysore — Facts regarding Border Dispute" published by the Government of Mysore). The statement is made no doubt because cotton and oil seeds are products of purely Kannad-speaking areas and a trade in those commodities goes to establish economic relations with those areas. The statement, therefore, shows how the Commission was misinformed and misguided. Another statement which should be called a mis-statement or misleading statement is as follows: "separate mother-tongue figures for this town were not compiled during the last census". It is not clear

what the Commission wishes to convey by their statement that the figures were not compiled during the census, if in fact they were supplied to the Commission for its consideration, whatever be the date on which they were compiled. The language hand-book which has been referred to already gives the separate mother-tongue figures for the town and that is a proof, if any were necessary, that they had been supplied to the Commission. It is rather strange that the Commission should consider the above ambiguous statement as a sufficient answer to the argument that the Belgaum town had an absolute Marathi majority.

21. The Commission having made the said ambiguous statement proceeds to support it by the following: "In the past, it has, however, for a variety of reasons, attracted a steady stream of immigrants from many areas." This is a very vague statement and it is not clear what is the authority or evidence for it and further on who were the so-called immigrants and when and from what areas did they come. If the immigrants were Kannad-speaking people, the argument for the Marathi majority becomes even stronger and will have to be conceded at once. On the other hand, if the immigrants were Marathi-speaking people, the Commission should have said so openly and categorically and not come out with a statement which is ambiguous. It may be pointed out that it is the argument of the Kannadigas that Marathi speaking people are immigrants or intruders in their sacred land of Karnatak. The Commission by trying to support such an argument has shown that it has not approached the question in any judicial frame of mind. It may be

added that in so far as the alleged immigration took place during a long "past" period, it could have had no relevance to the issue before the S. R. C. as it has none to the issue before the present Commission. The vague expression "past" shows only how the S. R. C. applied its mind.

22. After the said statements, the Commission carries on as follows: "Even if it is admitted that this town has now a Marathi majority, in view of the very slight Marathi majority in the Taluk of Belgaum and the fact that economic relations are not particularly marked with any linguistic area, the future both of the Taluk as well as the town should more properly be decided on administrative grounds." This single statement contains a number of different approaches and is thus enough to show the confusion in the Commission's mind. Having conceded the argument that the town has a Marathi majority, the Commission contend that the majority in the Taluk is only "very slight". Now the position for the Taluk including the town is that the Marathi majority is 51.4 per cent of the population as stated by the Commission itself. In the consideration of the Commission, is that a "very slight majority?" It should be remembered that the remaining population is not all Kannad-speaking and at least 14.6 per cent represent other languages which include Urdu and Konkani which are nearer Marathi than Kannad. The minimum that can be said about the Commission's observation that the Marathi majority is very slight, is that it has not adequately applied its mind to the question which it was called upon to decide.

23. Having proceeded from town to the Taluka, the Commission in one and the same sentence goes suddenly to the economic relations and makes another vague and sweeping statement that “economic relations are not particularly marked with any linguistic area”. Since evidently the Commission was thinking of cotton and oilseeds, any view held by the Commission on economic relations must be rejected at once as ill-founded and ill-informed. The details of economic relations will be given presently. But it is possible immediately to state that the Belgaum Taluka is mainly a paddy growing area, that imports are mainly of manufactured goods coming mostly from Bombay, that the traditional links in trade, commerce and communications are with the coastal belt which admittedly has no Kannad element, that the present transit trade with the purely Kannad-speaking areas is limited in volume and is in respect of some of the manufactured goods coming from Bombay as stated above. It would be most unreasonable to regard the said small volume of trade as sufficient to override the other considerations not merely of language but even of trade and commerce.

24. Having made the sweeping statement about economic relations, the Commission in the same single sentence suddenly changes its position and goes on to say that “the future of both the Taluk as well as the town should, more properly, be decided on administrative grounds”. It is difficult to decide here the exact meaning of the words “more properly”. It is clear that the Commission could not make up its

mind on the exact ground on which it should rest its decision. This is further evident from the "administrative ground" mentioned by it. The ground is as follows. "If as many as nine out of eleven Talukas go to the Karnatak then on administrative grounds the Belgaum town which is the district Head-quarters along with the Belgaum Taluka should go to Karnatak". It has already been pointed out that the Belgaum District is the result of historical processes. If the Head-quarters happens to be established at a place which is in a Marathi-speaking area, it does not mean that in a linguistic division of States the Head-quarters should go to the State which gets a majority of Talukas. Therefore, the Commission's statement that if as many as nine Taluks go to Karnatak the Head-quarter and its Taluk should go to Karnatak has no true logic about it. In fact when the Commission refers to nine Taluks, it omits altogether to consider the case of Khanapur Taluk which is predominantly Marathi-speaking and it omits also to consider the Nipani area of the Chikodi Taluka, though that area too is predominantly Marathi and its trade links are with the adjacent Maharashtra area. Once again it is clear that the Commission has failed to apply its mind to the real situation in the Belgaum District.

25. It has been difficult so far to point any one ground on which the Commission can be said to rely as its strongest ground. But as if this were not enough the last ground given by it and probably the one which weighed most with it would clearly prove the

untenability of the Commissions conclusions. That last and final ground is as follows :

“ We have recommended earlier that Bellary town along with Bellary Taluk should go to Andhra, although the town according to Justice Mishra’s Report did not have predominantly Andhra complexion. Our recommendation in respect of Belgaum town follows the same principles.”

26. It appears to the Samiti that every one would agree that the above is a most vicious argument in dealing with the rights and feelings of people. The Commission has elsewhere stated (*see* paragraph 333) that its conclusion about Bellary—“is the cumulative effect of three main considerations namely administrative convenience, economic links and the importance of the Tungabhadra project to the Rayalseema districts of Andhra”. Now how do these principles apply to the Belgaum Town and Taluka ? Administrative convenience is an expression which can be used when no other ground can be reasonably made. As pointed out elsewhere also in this Memorandum this is not a question of a State capital like Chandigarh or Madras. It is difficult to see what exactly is the administrative convenience in having the district Head-quarter. at one place rather than another. If the Belgaum town goes out of the Mysore State, no doubt a district Head-quarter will have to be found for the Kannad-speaking areas which still remain in Mysore State. But is that an inconvenience which must overrule other very much more substantial considerations ? It appears that the Commission did not apply its mind and try to grasp the true meaning of the words “ Administrative convenience”. The phrase as used

by the Commission in the present context does not have any content.

27. The second principle applied to Bellary was "economic links". It has already been shown that when the Commission referred to Cotton and Oil Seeds, it was ignorant of the economic links of Belgaum. The third principle applied by the Commission to Bellary related to Tungabhadra project. Since there is no Tungabhadra project or any similar river project in relation to Belgaum town and Taluk, the Bellary principle has no application at all to Belgaum.

28. The principles applied to Bellary have thus been disposed of in regard to their application to Belgaum. If one reads paragraphs 232 and 233 and then the concluding portion of paragraph 239 of Commission's Report, one cannot help suspecting that whether it was Kolar or Bellary or Belgaum, the Commission was thinking in terms of compensation to States for any territories claimed by them, but denied to them by the Commission. It is unfortunate that in so thinking of State rights, the Commission has misled itself completely. There can be no question of bargaining and compensation in such matters. A territory has to be either included or excluded from a State for some principle but there is no such thing as bargaining one territory for another.

29. By the normal rules of construction, the last ground given by the Commission should be held to be its main ground for arriving at the conclusion which it did. And that ground must now be held to be invalid because Parliament did not accept the Commission's recommendation about Bellary and

instead included that town and Taluka in the State of Mysore on the ground of "Linguistic gravity". It is thus clear that the commission's recommendation regarding Belgaum has no more any validity.

30. *Splitting up a district or Taluka—administrative convenience—village as a unit for demarcation.*—The question of splitting up a District or a Taluka has sometimes been considered by the S. R. C. as a matter relating to Administrative convenience and that is also the main ground of the Kannadigas. This matter therefore assumes some importance in the Re-organisation of States on the linguistic principle. A district or a Taluka in a border area will always have a portion where the majority language of that portion is different from the Majority language of the district or Taluka, as the case may be. In the present case the question is about a Marathi speaking portion which is contiguous to Maharashtra State and has an area of about 1070 sq. miles and a population of about 4·40 lakhs. *Prima facie* it looks absurd and lacking in principle to deny the people of the said portion their claim to join the State where their language is spoken. The S. R. C. was a high powered body and it was to lay down the principles for the division of the country. If it just accepts the district or taluka as formed by the British for their own convenience, it must be held to have failed in performance of its duty. It appears to the Samiti that no district or Taluk formed by any Government has any particular sanctity about it and all Governments at all times have altered and continue to alter and continue to alter the boundaries of districts and talukas according to their need. It will be a pity

that a population of nearly half a million are denied their wishes, because a Government or a Commission appointed by it is not in a mood at that moment to alter the boundaries of a district or a taluk. In separating areas the smallest administrative unit has to be chosen because that is the only Unit which is consistent with the principles. This smallest administrative unit is the village. A village is also the primary unit of human habitation. It is the primary unit likewise for census purposes. A Taluka is a mere collection of specified villages, and the boundaries of the Taluka can be altered at will by the powers that be. The villages on the other hand are generally spontaneous growths and do not depend on the will of such powers. It is hence that the Samiti in the past has contended for the village as a unit in the separation of the two language States of Mysore and Maharashtra. A district or a Taluka cannot be recognised as a unit for such a separation. The principles of village as a unit had in fact to be applied in finally determining the boundaries of the Madras and Andhra States. The validity of the principle of the village as a unit is not the less in the case of Andhra-Madras boundary because the division according to that principle was agreed to by the concerned Governments. If the principle is right the present One Man Commission also should apply it in the case of this dispute regarding the Belgaum District. The Bihar and Bengal (Transfer of Boundaries) Act, 1956 also accepts the village as a unit for purposes of demarcation.

31. *Belgaum district as a result of historical processes and hence there can be no objection to split it.*—The Belgaum District should be the best illustration of “the result of the historical processes” referred to in the resolution of 29th December 1953. The areas covered by the districts of Bijapur, Belgaum and Dharwar, when they were taken over by the British in 1818 were first included in the Collectorate of Bellary in Madras Presidency. In 1830 they were formed into a Dharwar Collectorate and added to the Bombay Presidency. A separate Belgaum district was not formed till about 1836, when certain territories had been acquired from the Kolhapur State. The area contiguous to the State of Kolhapur and certain other Indian States though its principal language was Marathi could not be held to be sufficient for the formation of a whole district. It was thus that this area, which is the area described in paragraph 4 above, came to be joined to a Kannad-speaking area for the purpose of formation of a district. The district thus became bilingual. This is an historical accident and it will be wrong to read into what took place an idea of forming a “Karnatak” district of Belgaum, Karnatak itself is a term of uncertain meaning geographically. In fact all the four so-called Karnatak districts of Belgaum, Dharwar, Bijapur and Karwar were during the British days called the Southern Maratha country. Happily the Commission is not concerned to enquire what were the true boundaries of the so-called Karnatak in ancient time. The Commission is concerned solely to find out the language or languages spoken in any area, whatever way that area might have been described

500 years ago or a thousand years ago. And, from what has been stated above, there should be no objection in principle to splitting up the present district of Belgaum in order to join the Marathi-speaking area described in paragraph 4 to the State of Maharashtra.

32. *Historical evidence of two distinct regions—Kannad and Marathi—in the present Belgaum District.*—The Belgaum District is a medley of different types of people, land, rainfall, climate, vegetation, language and culture. It is far from being homogeneous. Broadly speaking this district is comprised of two parts of district characteristics topographically, geographically, linguistically and culturally. Language is the pointer to this distinction. The eastern part of the district is predominantly Kannad and the western predominantly Marathi. These two parts can be shown to be divided by natural boundaries. Each part however is homogeneous within itself and these characteristics are responsible for the present border dispute. This description of the district is borne out by the Belgaum Gazetteer (1884) on page 2. The relevant portion is quoted below for ready reference :

“Belgaum, running parallel to the Sahyadri Hills, with a very irregular outline, measures a hundred miles from north to south and 50 to 80 miles from east to west. Kolhapur on the north-west and North Kanara on the south-west separate it in a great degree from the Sahyadri hills. But between these two districts a strip of about 20 miles broad passes west to the

crest of Sahyadris. This western tract, and in a less degree the rest of western fringe of the district, are rugged with forest or bush-covered hills and have comparatively damp and cool climate. A line drawn through Nipani, Sankeshwar, Pachapur, Ankalgi, Marihalli and Yellurgad includes the fringe of the district which in character and climate belongs to the bill rather than to the plain country. Within these limits the rainfall is heavier and the vegetation more abundant and the houses have pent roofs and wide eaves to carry the water clear of the mud walls. The rest of the district sloping gently to the east is broken by many ranges of low rolling hills and by bold single peaks and granite rocks."

It will be seen that the Gazetteer recognises the points of distinction between the two parts and the western part bears the characteristics of the Konkan type. A map illustrating this is annexed herewith (*vide* map Annexure 'D'). This division of the two parts has remained intact even today. This division is not only geographical but even linguistic and cultural.

So far as the Athani Taluka in the district is concerned the Gazetteer giving the description of the march of the British Troops in 1790 remarks that the marching armies "found the Krishna the boundary line of the Maratha and Kanerese languages and they also marked a difference in the style of houses on the two banks of the river. South of the Krishna the houses were flat roofed and covered with mud or clay, North of the Krishna the roofs were pitched and thatched" (page 388).

Both the above quotations clearly show that the dividing line was natural in point of both territory and language. The Belgaum Gazetteer further confirms this fact, while describing the conditions of Belgaum in 1357 in the following words : “ Thus, as before the border line of the Deccan and the Karnatak continued to pass through the present district of Belgaum ” (page 363). This clearly shows that even as far back as in the 14th century, there were two distinct regions of Marathi and Kannad, which are now both comprised in the present Belgaum District. The Marathi region lying to the west is connected with the coastal belt of Ratnagiri and Goa from the very beginning through several passes in the past and through well-built roads of Belgaum-Vengurla and Belgaum-Goa since the middle of the 19th century. This aspect is conveniently dealt with in paragraph 48.

33. *Further recognition in Standard Works of authority that the language of the disputed area is Marathi.*—What has been stated above regarding the western part being a Marathi region finds its corroboration in several authoritative works. Encyclopedia Britannica gives the extent of the area wherein Marathi language is spoken in the following words : “ Marathi occupies an irregular triangular area of approximately 100,000 sq. miles having its apex about the district of Balghat in the Central Province and for its base the Western Course of the Peninsula from Daman on the Gulf of Cambay in the North to Karwar on the open Arabian Sea in the South. It covers parts of two provinces of British India, Bombay and Central Provinces (including Berar) ” (*vide* Encyclopedia

Britanica, Vol. 14 "Marathi", page 856). ... This clearly includes the western part of the Belgaum District described above. The famous Historian Col. Marks Wilks in his treatise on the history of Mysore mentions in 1810 on page 7: "From Bedar the Maratha language is spread over the whole country to the north-westward of the Kanara and of a line which passes considerably to the eastward of Daoulatabad form an irregular sweep until it touches the Tapti and follows the course of that river to the western sea on which the district of the Sadashgur in North Kanara forms its southern limit". (Sadashgur means Sada-shivagad). This clearly includes the western part referred to above. We also append here an extract from "The Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute" to show that the language of this area in historical times was Marathi (Annexures 'E' and 'E1').

34. *The administrative objection answered.*—The Bombay Presidency excluding Sindh was divided into three divisions under Commissioners—Northern, Central and Southern. The Southern Division comprised six districts—(1) Belgaum, (2) Dharwar, (3) Karwar, (4) Bijapur, (5) Kolaba and (6) Ratnagiri. These divisions were formed by the British without reference to language or culture and even without reference to any so called "Karnatak" concept. The Kolaba and Ratnagiri districts were admittedly purely Marathi districts. Dharwar and Bijapur districts were purely Kannad districts. The remaining two districts Belgaum and Karwar were bilingual. The Divisional Headquarters were placed at Belgaum. But surely this was a matter of convenience and any

other place could have been appointed the Divisional Headquarters then or could be appointed now if the Commission recommends the transfer of the area in paragraph 4 above to the Maharashtra State. This position applies equally to the district Headquarters in the Belgaum town. The Headquarters of a district or a division is not a matter affecting the unity and security of a country. It is also not a matter involving any financial or administrative consideration like the capital of a State. If the Belgaum town goes to Maharashtra, it will not be difficult to select some other town for the Headquarters of what remains of the present Belgaum District. It will also be easy to select some other town for Divisional Headquarters. In fact after 1956 Kolaba and Ratnagiri districts have gone out of the earstwhile division and the Mysore State has been developing Dharwar where the Municipality has been established as a Corporation with the adjoining city of Hubli. The so-called administrative objection to transfer the Belgaum town to Maharashtra has little meaning. The Headquarters at Belgaum town has no financial or administrative implications like the Capital at Madras before the Andhra Act or the Capital at Chandigad before the Punjab Re-organisation Act or again the Capital at Bombay before the Bombay Re-organisation Act. The only issue in the present reference to the Commission is of language.

35. *Proof that the Marathi-speaking people are not intruders but have been permanent residents for long.*—It is somewhat remarkable that though the population of Belgaum District as a whole has naturally increased in the last hundred years and so,

and some increase took place when some Indian States which had provided pockets in the district were merged in it after independence, the percentages of the people speaking the two languages, viz., Kannad and Marathi, in the whole population have hardly changed. Thus the percentages to the entire population of the district of the Kannad and Marathi people in different years were as follows :—

*Proportion of Marathi and Kannad-speaking
population in the Belgaum District
(1881-1951)*

		Percentage					
		1881	1891	1901	1911	1921	1951
Marathi..	..	26·0	25·4	27·1	24·9	24·8	26·6
Kannad..	..	64·4	64·7	65·2	65·7	65·2	64·3

When the figures of the 1951 census were sorted in 1955 (*vide* the preface to census of India 1951 "Language Hand-Book" North Kanara and Belgaum Districts), they were 26·4 and 63·8 respectively. The percentage as so sorted in the 1951 census of persons who did not speak either of the said two languages was 9·8. The point is that a contention frequently made for the Kannad point of view that the Marathi speaking people have come into the district very recently, that they are intruders, that they do not really "belong", that this whole area is basically what is called "Karnatak", is not borne out by facts and is obviously put forth only for the purposes of the Kannad argument. The percentage of the Marathi-speaking people in the entire district has not

changed throughout the years and that shows that the Marathi-speaking people who are now found in the district as a whole have been permanent residents and are entitled to the same rights as the Kannadigas. The above consideration is for the district as a whole. The Marathi-speaking population thereof would be found mostly in the area described in paragraph 4 above, an area which is the western portion of the district and is contiguous to the Maharashtra State.

36. *No real question as at present before 1956:—* It will now be convenient to examine the position taken with reference to Belgaum by various different bodies and persons at different times. It may be pointed out immediately that before 1956, there was the separate State of Mysore and the only question at any time before 1956 was about the feasibility of forming a Kannad-speaking State on the linguistic basis out of any contiguous areas outside the said Mysore. It is not difficult to understand that it was not found feasible to make an independent State of such areas only, whether on financial or other grounds. Therefore, before 1956, if an independent Kannad State was not to be formed, there could be no real question of considering the problem as it has arisen now, of the Marathi-speaking areas of the Belgaum District.

37. *Attitude towards question—historical, since first World War.—*It has been generally admitted that there was a “phenomenal development of regional language in the 19th century which led to an emotional integration of the different language groups and the development amongst them of a consciousness

of being distinct cultural units” (see paragraph 44 of Report of S. R. C.). The matter began to receive particular attention after the first World War, when the question arose of granting self-Government. It was then that the Kannad-speaking people started their agitation for a Kannad State. As pointed out already, there was no question then about the princely Mysore State. It was therefore only in such circumstances that the Kannad agitation insisted on retaining the Belgaum Town and the other areas as described in paragraph 4 above within the proposed “Karnatak”. The Indian National Congress set up 21 Congress Committees in 1920 on the basis of language. One of the Committees was the Karnatak Provincial Congress Committee. Its Headquarters were at Gadag and not at Belgaum which may be a small point but deserves notice. In about 1917 had been set up also a Karnatak Unification Sabha. The Sabha and the Congress Committee joined hands and claimed for the proposed Karnatak State the whole of the Belgaum District including the Belgaum City. Shri Gangadharrao Deshpande, a resident of the Belgaum town, a member of the working Committee of the Congress and the leader of the Karnatak Provincial Congress Committee wanted the Congress to meet in Belgaum in 1924 when it was the turn of the Congress Karnatak Province to hold the Congress Session. It is interesting to know that he was opposed by the other Kannad leaders on the ground that the Congress should be held in a purely Kannad place like Bijapur or Mangalore and not a city like Belgaum with a predominantly Marathi spirit as it

was alleged. The whole story is given by Shri Gangadharrao Deshpande himself in his autobiography and even here it would be of no small interest to point out that the autobiography is in Marathi as "Mazi Jeevan Katha" (माझी जीवन कथा) and not in Kannad. The Congress was ultimately held at Belgaum in 1924, but surely no point can be made as is sought to be done sometimes that because the Congress was held at Belgaum as representing the Karnatak province, Belgaum must be held to have been established as part of Karnatak.

38. Trouble arose in 1929, when both the Kannad and Marathi people held their respective Sahitya Sammelans in Belgaum. Once again, the Congress leaders took a part in the controversy between the two peoples. All of them wanted to maintain the Congress point of view, but each one also wanted to maintain his position among his own people. The utterances by these Congressman are an attempt to reconcile the differences in a way which has now become too well known in Congress politics. Thus Shri D. V. Belvi, the Karnatak leader explained himself to his followers by saying that "I believe that the basis of the disorder at present rife in Karnatak is a misunderstanding that the convenors of the Sahitya Sammelan (i.e., Marathi) of Belgaum having in their mind of snatching Belgaum District for Maharashtra. When eight or nine years ago the Congress organised provinces on linguistic basis, no leader of Maharashtra said that the Belgaum District should be included in Maharashtra. If any Maharashtra leader says so I will strongly oppose him.

The population of Belgaum City is about 40 thousand of whom those who can read and write Marathi outnumber the Kannadings at present. All the trade of Belgaum is conducted mostly in Marathi." The holding of Marathi Sahitya Sammellan at Belgaum was thus justified by Shri Belvi to his followers.

39. Two months after the said statement of Shri Belvi, the Marathi Literary Conference took place. After conclusion of this conference, another public statement was issued signed by Shri N. C. Kelkar and Shri N. R. Gujal both from Poona and Shri D. V. Belvi and Shri Gangadharrao Deshpande both of Belgaum. This statement shows that at the instance of the said signatories Shri N. C. Kelkar moved a certain resolution at conference and that a portion of it had to be deleted as it was declared out of order and only the remaining portion accepted by the conference. It would be convenient to set out here from the said statement, the draft resolution as moved by Shri N. C. Kelkar and a portion of the comment of the signatories on what was deleted and what was passed by the conference:

“ Draft Resolution.”

“ Whereas the Kanarese-Marathi controversy now raging in Karnatak is undesirable in all respects and whereas in the opinion of this Conference, it is highly expedient in the interests of both parties to settle it amicably as early as possible.

This conference do hereby resolve—

(1) that the District of Belgaum is a part of Karnatak and that in this District Kanarese is the

predominant language, i.e., the language of the majority.

(2) that therefore the Marathi people in this District should give respect to it due thereto as the predominant language in the District.

(3) that alongwith it the Kanarese people in the District should extend to Marathi respect due to it as a sister language and grant due and necessary protection to it as the language of a minority in the District.

This conference further expresses its desire that the Karnatak Literary Conference should also pass a resolution in terms of the principles embodied in clause (2) and (3) above and help it in maintaining good feelings between Karnatak and Maharashtra.”

“ It happened however that a technical point of order was raised by some members of the Subjects Committee as to whether clause (1) was in order or not in a purely literary conference. We argued and maintained that was perfectly in order but original objection was upheld by the President and clause being declared out of order had to be deleted. The consequence was that the remaining clauses of the resolution though expressing a view which we entirely approve of and can sincerely support at any time, presented a resolution which was imperfect and incomplete for our purpose and therefore we could not be a party to such a resolution. We had therefore to express our formal dissent from the Resolution both in the Subjects Committee as well as in the open Conference ”.

40. Therefore the attempt of the Congress leaders to have the district of Belgaum declared as a part of Karnatak failed at the conference. The said public statement however has been relied upon by the Mysore Government mainly no doubt because it bears the signature of the well-known Maharashtrian leader Shri N. C. Kelkar. It is still clear that the draft resolution was an attempt of all the Congress leaders who signed it to secure approval for the Congress point of view in the formation of its provincial Committees. The draft resolution therefore, proves nothing as against the Marathi speaking people themselves. At best it is an opinion of Shri N. C. Kelkar as an individual. That opinion is now not relevant and the question before the Commission must be determined according to the facts found by it.

41. *Belgaum Town.*—It should be necessary to offer some remarks here as regards the town of Belgaum in view of certain contentions frequently made by the Kannad speaking people and the Government of Mysore. As explained already the area described in para four above was surrounded before independence by the Portuguese territory of Goa and the Indian States of Sawantwadi, Kolhapur, Sangli, Miraj and Kurundwad and finally the Kannad speaking areas. The same area was not large enough to constitute a British district by itself and the only British area to which it could be joined for the purpose of forming a district was a Kannad speaking area. It is thus that we find that the Marathi speaking population of the area described in para 4 above has become a minority in the Belgaum district as we find it, the proportion

of the Marathi speaking population to the Kannad-speaking population being 25 to 65 per cent. The Belgaum Town was made the Head quarter of the district not because of any Karnatak concept as contended by the Kannad speaking people but for the convenience of the British rulers who at that time could have had no linguistic considerations in mind. In fact if they had any linguistic considerations in mind, it is hardly likely that the Military Centre at Belgaum would have been called by them the Maratha Light Infantry Centre. A Maratha Light Infantry Centre in a Karnatak area would have easily been seen by them as being offensive to Karnatak sentiments and the Britishers were at least good administrators and would have avoided any such offence. But Belgaum Town has its advantages of climate and scenery-matters which certainly may have appealed to the British. Forgetting then for a moment the Karnatak concept one has to examine the geographical position of the Belgaum Town. That position is that it is so situated as to be an outlet for the Coastal places, going from North to South, of Rajapur, Malvan, Vengurla, Sawantwadi, Goa and Karwar through different passes in the Sahyadri Range of mountains. The northern most places out of these viz., Rajapur and Malvan have access to Nipani also which is the Northern-most town in the area described in para 4 above. There was a centuries old trade and commerce between the Belgaum Town and the coastal belt. The vegetation and the scenery of Belgaum is like that of the coastal belt which is called Konkan. The Kannad-speaking areas to the North-East, East

and South-East of Belgaum Town and Taluk are separated by hill ranges and communications of the Belgaum Town and Taluk with those areas were never developed as those with the coastal places mentioned above. The trade and commerce of the Belgaum Town with the Kannad speaking areas was considerably less than the trade and commerce with the coastal belt. It is not that the Marathi speaking people were intruders or latecomers to Belgaum, but that the town being the Headquarter of a district which had a Kannad majority and being later also the Divisional Headquarter of a Kannad division attracted some Kannad speaking people to the town. It is thus the Kannadigas who are latecomers and who do not "belong". The boot is thus on the other leg, when the Kannadigas contend that the Marathi speaking people have come here only lately.

42. *Culture.*—The Maharashtrian aspect and culture of the place are evident in a number of ways. For a population like that of Belgaum there could be no better evidence of this than the temples which denote the religion of the people. It is the temples which show the mass feeling, and of the thirteen temples of the town, which have endowments, ten are managed by the Marathi people and only three by Kannad people. As regards administration, the records of the Municipality which was established in 1850 were in Marathi and continue to be so to this day notwithstanding the wishes of the Mysore Government and the Kannad people. The record of the village officers of the Belgaum Town was in Marathi till 1924, when only the language was changed to Kannad by order

of the Government. The language actually used in the Civil Courts was Marathi until the linguistic question arose in the twenties, when the High Court of Bombay declared the language of the Court at Belgaum for the purposes of the Civil Procedure Code to be both Marathi and Kannad. Similarly under section 356 of the Code of Criminal Procedure 1898, the Governor-in-council by an order dated 10th November 1908 had declared "both Kanarese and Marathi to be the languages in ordinary use in the criminal court of the District of of Belgaum." Then as regards trade and commerce the tradesmen's accounts were always kept in the Marathi language and in many cases this was so even if the tradesman concerned was a Kannad speaking person. The majority of name-boards and sign-boards in the town were always purely in Marathi or Marathi and English, and Kannad has only latterly started making its appearance on the boards. Educationally the number of students in the primary school for different periods was as follows:—

TABLE

Year	Marathi		Kannad		Urdu-Marathi	
	No. of schools	No. of pupils	No. of schools	No. of pupils	No. of schools	No. of pupils
1878-79	8	511	3	267	1	43
1888-89	7	940	2	320	Not available	
1953-54	29	10,345	11	3,010	10	1,740
1960-61	35	12,953	15	4,114	10	1,937
1966-67	36	18,932	15	8,021	10	4,101

The first school that was started at Belgaum in 1830 was a Marathi School,

It is interesting in this connection to note that in the Urdu schools intended for the benefit of Muslims, all the ten Urdu primary schools have been Urdu-Marathi schools and there was not a single Urdu-Kannad school at any time. It may be pointed out here that primary education is a better guide than Secondary or higher education in considering the true language position at any place. Students in primary schools are children of the locality, but those in Secondary schools or colleges may sometimes be outsiders, the above table is therefore instructive. Finally as regards the arts, Music and drama are only in Marathi. Kannad plays are being acted in Belgaum only in the last five years. It is well-known that Marathi stage like the Bengali stage is among the most advanced in the country and Belgaum has always been a well-known centre of the Marathi stage. Gymnasia (Akhadas) are a peculiarity of Maharashtra and Belgaum had 20 Akhadas in 1955. Public celebrations of the Ganapati Festival are as much a characteristic of the Belgaum Town as any town in Maharashtra and this applies equally to the celebration of the birth anniversary of Chhatrapati Shivaji Maharaj. Circulation figures of Marathi and Kannad and other periodicals through the newspaper agents for the town and the Cantonment area are given below for comparison :—

Marathi	Kannad	English	Hindi	Gujarathi	Urdu
10,015	2,020	3,226	210	55	40

(Vide Annexure F)

43. Culture has been defined by the S. R. C. in para 165 of its report. In the opinion of the Samiti the culture of the Belgaum Town in each one of its different aspects is Maharashtrian or Marathi culture. It is impossible for this culture to thrive or even to survive in a State whose official language is Kannad with the present state of feelings between the two communities. Thus from whatever point of view one looks at it, historically, linguistically, culturally, the Belgaum Town has to go with the adjoining Marathi area of the Maharashtra State.

44. *Social structure, life, traditions and institutions of the Marathi-speaking population.*—The area described above in paragraph 4 is like a part of Maharashtra. It is linguistically and culturally homogeneous with Maharashtra. The Marathi-speaking people of this area have the same social and cultural institutions as the people of Maharashtra. Their traditions, marriage ceremonies, religious rites and customs and manners are the same as those of the people of Maharashtra. The social structure of this Marathi speaking area is unmistakably identical with the social structure of Maharashtra. One finds here the same stratified structure of caste organisation exactly in the same way as in other part of Maharashtra viz. Brahmins, Marathas, Mahars etc., while the social structure of Karnatak comprises chiefly Vaishnav Brahmins, Lingayats, Kurburs and Vakkaligas. Village Patils and Vatandars of this area are Marathi-speaking and mostly drawn from the Maratha Community. The blood relationship of the Marathi-speaking people of this area is largely with the people

of Kolhapur, the coastal belt of Ratnagiri and Goa, Poona and other part of Maharashtra and not with the adjoining Kannad speaking population. This will be borne out by what has been stated in the Census of India 1951—

“ Women migrate for marriage and men for jobs. Hence in migration between adjacent districts, females predominated—11,626 males and 22,484 females born in Kolhapur district were enumerated in Belgaum, and 14,093 males and 27,329 females born in Belgaum were enumerated in Kolhapur—

“ Where females predominate in a migration stream, it is evidence, amounting to certainly that the migration is marriage migration.”

45. To speak about religious traditions, the Maharashtrian aspect is perceived unmistakably in this area. The inhabitants of this part are generally worshippers of the dieties in Maharashtra like Ambabai and Jotiba of Kolhapur, Khandoba of Jejuri, Vithoba of Pandharpur and Bhavani of Tulajapur. The followers of the sects of Dnyaneshwara, Tukaram, Ramdas and other Maharashtrian saints are spread in the whole of this area. Similarly there are Bhajan Mandals all over the area and the religious songs sung are those of the Maharashtrian saints only. The religious literature that is read and recited and Kirtans and religious discourses are also all in Marathi. There are practically no such programmes in Kannad and if there be any, they are far and few between. The typical

wrestling habit of the Maharashtrians is assimilated in the field of physical culture in this area and Akhadas (Gymnasia) are, spread throughout this area. Not a month passes when there are no wrestling competitions.

46. Marathi people, it is an admitted fact are more enlightened in this area and all activities and movements, be they in the social, political, educational or cultural field, that originate in Maharashtra, easily capture the imagination of the people here and take root deeply. This is not so in Kannad areas. In the matter of social reforms initiated by Justice M. G. Ranade, Agarkar, G. K. Gokhale, Jotiba Phule, Maharshi Karve and others, this area has kept pace with Maharashtra and never lagged behind. Political movements led by Lokamanya Tilak and others found a stronghold in this area. Literature, drama, stage, music and other fine arts in this area bear a Maharashtrian imprint typical by itself. People in this whole area read Marathi literature and this region has often provided the local for Marathi fiction. This area has produced renowned scholars, authors and poets in Marathi like R. B. Gunjekar, M. G. Telang, Natu, Bhate, Bhausaheb Soman *alias* Kirat, K. H. Dixit, A. N. Karnataki, A. B. Lathe, S. R. Sunthakar, Ranjit Desai, Sathe, Marathe and several others. The circulation of Marathi newspapers and periodicals is much more than the Kannad ones generally and in the interior parts it is exclusively Marathi. Dramas staged here are Marathi dramas. The folk songs that are sung like Povadas (ballad) and Lavanis (amorous songs) and Tamashas (folk

dramas) that are performed here are typically Maharashtra in character. The celebration of Birth Anniversary of Shivaji the Great is observed throughout this area with great enthusiasm ; so also the public celebration of the Ganapati Festival. Both these celebrations were started by Lokamanya Tilak which spread over in this area immediately.

47. The pioneers in the field of printing were the Marathi people. The first printing Press started at Belgaum in the sixties of the last century was Marathi. Even the Kannad people got their printing work done in Marathi (Devanagari) script and it was long after that there was Kannad printing press. Almost all the publications were in Marathi and the volume of such publication work has grown to a considerable extent. The publications in Kannad were comparatively very few till ten years ago.

48. *Communications and Trade.*— It is an important feature of this area that geographically it has natural connecting links with the coastal belt of Ratnagiri and Goa. To quote Shri Y. S. Pandit from his scholarly book “Economic Conditions in Maharashtra and Karnatak”, “The Unbroken Sahyadris isolate Konkan from the Deccan except near Belgaum, where they vanish all of a sudden for over fourteen miles, there is no other convenient outlet” (page 4). This favourable factor has facilitated communications between this area and the coastal belt since historical times. There are nine chief passes through which communications with the coastal belt have been established, and they are from north to south, (1) Phonda, (2) Amboli, (3) Ramghat, (4) Chorla, (5) Paryad, (6) Kel, (7) Tameri, (8) Tinai, (9) Mangeli. Of these

Phonda, Amboli and Tinai passes have metalled and bridged roads. The Ram pass which was once fit for cars is out of use now giving place to Amboli pass which has a very heavy traffic. The passes of Chorla, Parvad, Kel, Tameri, Tinai and Mangeli join this Marathi area with Goa while the rest join it with Ratnagiri. Through these passes this whole area was joined to the sea ports of Chiplun, Vijaydurg, Rajapur, Malwan, Vengurla and Goa (*vide* Belgaum District Gazetteer, pages 305 to 307). These passes have been traditional links between this area and the coastal belt.

49. The important market centres of Belgaum District as a whole are Belgaum, Nipani, Nandgad, Gokak, Bailhongal, Athani and Sankeshwar. Of these Belgaum, Nipani and Nandgad are situated in this area while the rest are in Kannad area of the district. The Belgaum Gazetteer (1884) has given description of these market centres with their export and import and the articles of trade of each of these markets. From that description it can be easily seen that even in the past this Marathi area had close trade relations with Bombay, Poona, Savantwadi, Malwan, Vengurla, Chiplun, Rajapur, Sangli—important market places in Maharashtra. Markets in this area had very small trade with Kannad areas or Karnatak. The markets of Bailhongal, Gokak, Athani and Sankeshwar had trade relations mainly with the Kannad areas of Gadag, Guledgad, Hubli, Kaladgi, Rabkavi, Jamkhandi. They had also trade with Bombay, coastal ports of Ratnagiri, Sholapur and Miraj. But these market centres in Kannad part of the district had

no close trade links with Belgaum, Nipani and Nandgad (*vide* Belgaum District Gazetteer, pages 312-315, also pages 345, 525-526, 575, 590, 591).

50. These trade relations continue even to this day except with the change that after the advent of the Railway, the trade with Bombay which was formerly carried via sea ports is now carried by the Railway. New factors also have entered in. Nipani has developed into an important centre of Tobacco in India. It has become a centre of Jaggery also. A substantial portion of trade of both these commodities from Nipani is with Maharashtra. Belgaum has also developed as a marketing centre for jaggery and sweet potatoes. These articles are brought to Belgaum from the Chandgad Taluka (now in Maharashtra) and the Marathi area surrounding Belgaum and exported to Maharashtra and Gujarat areas via., Kolhapur. The whole of Chandgad Taluka which was transferred to the Kolhapur District of Maharashtra by the States Reorganisation Act depends entirely on Belgaum for its trade and Commerce. The co-operative marketing societies of Chandgad and Turkewadi in Chandgad Taluka have their offices working at Belgaum. Since Goa became free the volume of trade of Belgaum with Goa has enormously increased. Belgaum has become a centre of Small Scale Industries and their manufactured products are exported to Bombay and other districts of Maharashtra and even overseas. Only Engineering goods are sent to Mysore State area. A rough variety of Paddy from Belgaum and Khanapur talukas is in recent years exported to Kerala in large quantities. The volume

of trade of this area with the Kannad areas is comparatively small.

51. *Administrative or Official Language.*—In considering the linguistic composition of the Belgaum District an attempt is sometimes made to trace the history of the Administrative or Official Language of the district. It has got to be borne in mind that whenever this history is traced, it is of the district as a whole and not of the part of the district with which the Marathi people are concerned. One is apt to mistake the information about the district as being that about this part. It is contended by the Mysore Government that the official language of the district of Belgaum was Kannad since the introduction of the British Rule. On the face of it the statement is wrong, because at the date of the advent of the British Rule, there was the administration of the Peshwas having Marathi as their official language. This state of affairs continued even during the British Rule for a considerable number of years. We quote here a passage from the Mysore Dasara Souvenir, 1964, published by Director of Publicity and Information, Government of Mysore which will bear out the above statement :

“ Till 1818 the North Karnatak was under the Peshwas. Naturally the Marathi language of the Peshwas was the language of fashion. The situation continued to be the same for a long time even under the British Rule. The language of the courts and offices was Marathi, the language in schools was Marathi, accounts in shops were maintained in

Marathi, the language of fashion and culture was Marathi.”

52. The official language of the district of Belgaum was initially Marathi and there was a gradual shift from Marathi to Kannad. The records of the Inam Commissions appointed under the Acts of 1852 and 1863 are an ample proof of this even to this day. A glance at the records of the Alienation Office in Poona will support the contention that the original grants, statments recorded, Sanads issued are found to be in Marathi language and even in Modi script. The Revenue Department used to keep its correspondence and record in Marathi. After the Belgaum District was separated from Dharwar District and Belgaum town was made the district Head Quarters, the impact of Kannad which was the spoken language of the major portion of the district on Marathi increased. Changes from Marathi to Kannad were made from time to time. As a specimen of how a change was wrought, we quote below a Resolution contained in a latter No. 2005 of 1874 dated 8th April 1874 :

“ *Resolution.*—Canarese should be declared to be the language in ordinary use in the Criminal Courts of the district of Belgaum under section 337 of the Criminal Procedure Code and if Magistrates whose vernacular language is Marathi but who are insufficiently acquainted with Canarese to take down evidence in that language are employed in those parts of the district where Marathi is generally spoken the Government on application by the District Magistrate will direct under section 335 that such

Magistrates shall take down the evidence in cases tried by them in their own vernacular language i.e. Marathi”.

53. The resolution throws light on the linguistic change that came to be effected displacing Marathi and introducing Kannad in its stead. It also indicates that the district was divided into two parts in which Marathi and Kannad were generally and respectively spoken. This resolution also illustrates how two languages were attempted to be adjusted officially. An instance of the working of this resolution is found in a Resolution No. 2358 of 1874, dated 23rd April 1874 directing Raosaheb Dhondo Anant Wad, Second Class Magistrate of Taluka Bidi (now the Khanapur Taluka) to take down evidence in Marathi language under section 335 of the Criminal Procedure Code. This arrangement regarding the use of both languages did not, it appears, work satisfactorily and a Government Notification dated 10th November 1908 (*Bombay Gazette*, Part I, page 1940) made provision declaring “ Kanarese and Marathi to be the languages in ordinary use in the criminal courts of the District of Belgaum ”. Thereafter a Government Notification G.N. 4-D, No. 2433/2, dated 21st September 1927 (*Bombay Gazette*, Part I, page 2255) was issued declaring “ both Marathi and Kanarese shall be the languages of the Civil Courts at Belgaum and Chikodi in the Belgaum District”.

After the merger of the Deccan States in the Indian Union, the Collector, Belgaum informed the Bombay Government on 12th September 1950 of the languages

in which the official records were maintained in the talukas as follows :

Taluka or Mahal	Languages in which official record is maintained
Chikodi English, Marathi and Kannad.
Belgaum English, Marathi and Kannad.
Khanapur English, Marathi and Kannad.
Shahapur Marathi.

[Vide Annexure G (1 to 5)]

All this will show that the language in force in the area in dispute for administration purposes was never purely Kannad as contended by the Kannad people.

54. *Kannad people read and write Marathi in the disputed area.*—The Marathi atmosphere of the Belgaum town and the rest of the area described in paragraph 4 above affects certain matters which have received prominence in the controversy which has been going on the said area for the last few years. The Marathi speaking people may be a minority in the district taken as whole, but their predominance in the said area is so complete that it has affected the language habits even of the people whose mother-tongue is not Marathi. Almost all people of the said area whose mother-tongue is Kannad also know and speak Marathi although there was a systematic agitation by their leaders at the time of the 1951 census in order that the Kannad speaking people should deny knowledge of any subsidiary language like Marathi for the purposes of the Census. The Marathi atmosphere is

so overwhelming that many Kannad persons read and write in Marathi as if it was their mother-tongue. This fact could not be made clearer that by the autobiography in Marathi of Shri Gangadharrao Deshpande which has been referred to already, the book is over 450 pages of 1/8th demy size closely printed. Shri Gangadharrao Deshpande was editor of a Marathi weekly newspaper called "Dhureen". Shri Belvi was equally well versed in Marathi and the extract given in paragraph 38 above is an English rendering of the original Marathi written by Shri Belvi. Shri B. N. Datar who was for many years a Minister in the Central Government and was politically a keen protagonist of the Karnatak movement, represented the Belgaum Parliamentary Constituency and probably the first language he learnt in school was Marathi and not Kannad. When the Marathi Literary Conference was being held in Belgaum in 1929, Shri Datar wrote and published a booklet in Marathi on the true nature of Kannad-Marathi controversy. It was inevitable that the Kannad mother-tongue people of the area described in paragraph 4 above should know and speak Marathi which was the language of the majority in the area. The Kannadigas have twisted this fact for the purpose of their Karnatak argument by saying that the Maharashtrais are not merely intruders but have an aggressive disposition and have cussedly refused to learn the language of Karnatak. The fact is that in any area or country of the world the minority for social and economic reasons, comes to know the language of the majority and even Maharashtrais who are in Dharwar or Bijapur or Bangalore know Kannad.

55. *Muslims.*—The above position in relation to Kannad mother-tongue people applies in the case of other communities also like Muslims, Christians, Gujaratis, Parsis and Marwaries in the area. Reference has already been made to the Urdu-Marathi schools for the Muslims. The Belgaum District Gazetteer published in 1884 even records the fact that various Muslim sects spoke Marathi and even learnt Marathi alongwith Urdu, Arabic and Persian. There is a Muslim Co-operative Bank in Belgaum since 1924. It maintains its record in Marathi and its annual reports are published in Marathi. The 1957 General Elections, there was a Muslim candidate for the Belgaum City Constituency of the Mysore Legislative Assembly. But in 1962 General Election when there was no Muslim candidate, they have voted for the Samiti Candidate.

56. *Gujaratis and Marwaries.*—The position of the Gujarati and Marwari communities is similar to the above and they all speak Marathi. In a place like Nipani even the books of accounts are kept in Marathi by the Gujarati-tradesmen, and this is most significant in the case of a Commercial Community like the Gujaratis.

57. *Christians.*—The remaining community to be considered here is the Christian community and the Konkani language which many of them speak. In regard to Konkani, there is some controversy as to whether it is a dialect of Marathi or whether, it is a separate language derived from a common parent Prakrit. In this Memorandum we are not concerned

with the expert controversy carried on by scholars. We have here a more practical aim and object and there is little doubt that a Konkani speaking person cannot only follow Marathi but after a little social intercourse can also speak that language. The structure of the two languages is the same and their vocabulary common to a great extent. We refer here to the examples given in para 162 of the Report of Representatives of the Maharashtra Government. In any case Konkani is akin to Marathi and there can be no question of any affinity between it and a thoroughly Dravidian tongue like Kannad, Linguistically, even if it is not a dialect of Marathi, it can be classified with Marathi in a Reorganisation of States.

58. *Economic Relations of the Belgaum Town.*—As regards the Economic and Commercial aspect, Belgaum has intimate relations with Maharashtra and not with Kannad areas. In paragraph 49 above it has been pointed out that Belgaum town had close trade relations with Bombay, Poona, Sangli, Nasik and the coastal areas in the past. Belgaum is really the nerve centre of the Marathi areas of the Belgaum, Khanapur and Chandgad Talukas. It was also the nerve centre of the trade and commerce of the south Ratnagiri District.

Before the Reorganisation of States more than 80 per cent of the total trade of Belgaum was with Maharashtra, the annual total volume being roughly estimated at Rs. 6 crores and 50 lakhs. Trade with the Southern part of Ratnagiri District was alone worth rupees two crores. Malvan, Banda, Vengurla, Aronda,

Shiroda and Sawantwadi depended entirely for all their requirements on Belgaum. The few commodities they had for sale were brought to Belgaum and they purchased their requirements at Belgaum. They had their supply of rice from the tracts of Belgaum, Khanapur and Haliyal. The petty traders from Konkan depended entirely on the merchants of Belgaum. Out of 5,300 and odd shops and Commercial—Establishments registered under Shops Act at Belgaum, about 4,500 were owned and managed by Maharashtrians. These Maharashtrian Establishments supported the precarious economy of the South Konkan by providing loans and advances, credit and transport facilities etc. to the small traders and agriculturists of South Konkan. Commodities such as bettlenut, cashew-nut, cocoanut etc. worth about two lakhs used to be imported from Ratnagiri district into Belgaum and Commodities such as foodgrains, sugar, tea, edible oils, matches, jaggery etc., used to be exported from Belgaum to Ratnagiri district, the value estimated thereof being about Rs. 190 lakhs (*vide* Annexure H).

After the Reorganisation of States however, the trade with the Konkan areas is practically at a stand still and this loss is not being compensated by trade with Mysore State areas. The main reasons for this loss of trade are—(1) the formation of Rice Zones, Belgaum being included in the South Zone and (2) double incidence of Sales-Tax and Motor vehicle tax. How severely the blow has been dealt to the Commercial relations between the border areas and the Konkan is best illustrated by the figures from the

Nandgad branch of the Belgaum Bank Ltd. a scheduled bank, given below:

Particulars	Year 1955	Year 1960
1. Total amount of bills purchased being drawn on parties in Ratnagiri.	3,32,000	Nil.
2. Total amount of drafts drawn by the branches on Nandgad Branch.	3,01,000	Nil.

Belgaum is a commercial place of importance but not a first rate market like Sangli, Kolhapur or Poona. The trade of Belgaum consists of (1) local agricultural produce and manufactured articles, (2) imports and (3) exports. The agricultural produce of Belgaum and surrounding areas is mainly of Paddy and Rice, Nachana (Bagi), Jaggery, Potatoes and Sweet-potatoes. Annually on an average Belgaum receives five lakhs of jaggery blocks and one lakh bags of sweet potatoes, 80 per cent. of the jaggery comes from the surrounding Marathi areas and all the sweet potatoes come from Chandgad Taluka and the western part of the Belgaum Taluka. These articles as well as the manufactured articles are exported to markets in Maharashtra.

Belgaum imports a large quantity of manufactured goods such as textiles and woollen goods, petrol and petroleum products, rubber goods, hardware stationery, brass and copper goods, colours and paints, leather goods, electric material etc. From Bombay, Poona, Ahmadabad, Agra, Kanpur, Punjab, Madras etc. Nearly half of these comes from Bombay alone.

Detailed information regarding imports into and exports from Belgaum are supplied in detail in Annexures I and J.

Manufactured Articles.—Belgaum may not be a big manufacturing centre but it has its own industries and manufactured goods. The following can be mentioned as the important industries in this city : (1) Groundnut oil, (2) Hosiery, (3) Copper and Brass Pots and Brass casting, (4) Silk Thread, (5) Weaving particularly saree weaving, (6) Sopa, (7) Silver and Gold articles, (8) Leather Goods, (9) Tanning, (10) Furniture works, (11) Iron casting, (12) Ghee. Some of these industries like brass and iron casting are feeders to big industries in Maharashtra like Coopers, Kirloskar and Voltas. Articles manufactured here are exported to Bombay, Poona, Nasik, Kolhapur, Gujarat, Calcutta, Punjab and other places in India. Konkan side such as Ratnagiri District mainly depends on this city for such finished articles. The export to the Kannad area is to a very small extent.

Herewith is annexed (Annexure K) a statement showing the information regarding small scale and large scale industries in Belgaum District as it stood in 1955. The figures quoted below are in respect of the industries in Belgaum Town :

Serial No.	Industry	Product manufactured	Value	Market for products
			Rs.	
1	Rice Milling	.. Rice	Local.
2	Tanning	.. Tanned hides and skins.	5,60,000	London and Madras.
3	General Engineering	Agricultural .. implements, Machine parts.	9,25,000	Mysore State.
4	Saw Milling	.. Sawn Timber.	2,00,000	Local and nearby districts.
5	Hosiery and knitting goods.	Hosiery ..	1,10,000	Military Centres and Police Department.

Serial No.	Industry	Product manufactured	Value	Market for products
			Rs.	
6	Silk and Arts Silk, etc.	Sarees, shirting.	9,60,000	Bombay State.
7	Silk Twisting ..	Doubled Art Silk.	4,20,000	Bombay State.
8	Agarbattj Manufacturing.	Agarbattis ..	46,400	Belgaum District and nearby Districts.

This information relates to 1955. The following table gives information regarding some of the important industries at present :

Type of Industry	Products	Approximate value of products	Market for products
1	2	3	4
(Rs. in lakhs)			
1. Engineering Industries (ancillary to big factories).	Cranks, Turned parts castings-ferous and non-ferous.	35	Bombay, Poona, Satara, Sangli, Kolhapur.
2. Power Looms (Ancillary to Bombay Mills).	Dhotees and Panchas.	40	Bombay.
3. Foundries (Ancillary to big concerns).	Fly wheels, plough parts, pump parts, other engine parts.	20	Kolhapur, Sangli, Karad, Satara, Poona and Bombay.
4. Packing material ..	Planks for boxes.	12	Satara and Poona.
5. Body Building ..	Truck bodies ..	18	Kolhapur, Sholapur, Sangli, Poona, Ratnagiri, Goa, Bijapur, Dharwar.
6. Plastic ..	Tapes and bags.	7	Bombay, Poona and Defence Department.
7. Soap ..	Washing soap ..	25	Maharashtra and Karnatak.

Kannad areas have their own separate commercial centres which have no vital connections with Belgaum or the Marathi areas. Marketing centres of Karnatak such as Hubli, Byadagi, Davengeri have no close contacts with Belgaum market. Even in the Belgaum District itself, Kannad areas have their own independent trading centres and commercial regions. Bailhongal is the centre for cotton. Ramdurg and part of Hukeri and Chikodi Talukas are groundnut regions. Gokak which is a central place for the Kannad areas of the district is another important centre for these areas.

Kannad villages even in the Belgaum Taluka have trade connections with the Belgaum city only to a small extent. According to column 31 of the table headed Primary Census Abstract in the 1951 Census Handbook, Belgaum (including Shahapur) is the bazaar place for weekly bazaars for 77 villages of which 62 are from the area which the Samiti claims and only 15 from the Kannad area. Kannad area in the Belgaum Taluka has weekly bazaar places like Sulebhavi, Ankalgi, Mugutkhan-Hubli, Bagewadi.

The facts set forth above go to establish that Belgaum has intimate economic and commercial relations with Maharashtra. Next to Maharashtra, it has trade relations with the Northern parts of the country and to some extent with Madras and Andhra. Those with Kannad area are comparatively to a very small extent. The contention that Belgaum has closer economic affinities with Kannad area does not hold water.

59. *Chandgad Taluka—Formation and its effects.*—

We have stated already how Governments always alter the boundaries of talukas. One alteration made by the State Government immediately after the merger of the Deccan States, however, affects the picture of the Belgaum District as it emerged after the alteration and after the States Re-organisation Act from the language point of view. Before the merger of the Deccan States, there was no Chandgad Taluka as such in the district. There was only a Chandgad Mahal of the Belgaum Taluka at that time. When the Chandgad Taluka was formed after the said merger, a number of villages from the Belgaum Taluka but outside the Chandgad Mahal were transferred to the New Chandgad Taluka. The villages so transferred were predominantly Marathi-speaking. One thus easily understands how the Chandgad Taluka at the time of S. R. C. Report came to have over 92 percent Marathi-speaking population. But the other effects were that the percentage of the Marathi population in the Belgaum Taluka, to which a large number of villages were added from the merged Deccan States, went down. This position will be clear from the table at the foot of this paragraph. The point is that the most contentious area in the whole controversy before the present commission is the town of Belgaum and that is a part of the Belgaum Taluka and although that Taluka is adjacent to Chandgad taluka, it has been possible for the Kannad people to contend and for the S.R.C. to admit that the majority of the Marathi-speaking people in the Belgaum taluka is only "slight" Chandgad taluka whatever the language percentages

may be, was after all an integral part of the Marathi-speaking area of the Belgaum District, but somehow the S.R.C. was persuaded to transfer the Chandgad Taluka to Maharashtra, but retained the Belgaum Town and Taluka and the rest of the Marathi-speaking area of the district in the Mysore State. All this position shows how the alterations and the splittings, have affected the rights of the Marathi-speaking people.

TABLE

Belgaum-Taluka (before and after the merger of Deccan States).

	No. of villages	Area in sq. miles	Total population	Marathi	Kannad
Former Belgaum Taluka.	145	475.5	2,19,821	1,20,755	64,584
Percentage				54.9	29.3
Present Belgaum Taluka (after merger of States).	153	394.4	2,80,693	1,39,760	99,818
Percentage				49.8	35.5

60. *70 per cent and status-quo.*—There is a contention of the Mysore Government that where the *status quo* is to be changed, the majority language should have a percentage of 70 or more to the population. This argument is against the transfer of Belgaum and Khanapur Talukas in the same way as Chandgad since the Marathi-speaking population of Belgaum and Khanapur Talukas is only 49.8 per cent and 54.3 per cent respectively. The contention of the

Mysore Government is that the *status quo* of these Talukas as part of the Belgaum District should not be changed. This argument on the basis of *status quo* cannot really be said to be established because the Kannad-speaking population of the entire district before 1956, i.e., including Chandgad was only 64·3 per cent. Thus if there were any sanctity about the principle of 70 per cent and the *status quo* as stated above, the whole of the Belgaum District should have continued with the Bombay State and should not have been transferred to the newly formed Mysore State. The Samiti has shown elsewhere that there is no basis for the alleged principles of 70 per cent and *status quo*. What the commission is concerned with is a contiguous area of a majority language and this area has to be determined irrespective of the artificial divisions of district or taluka. The only relevant unit for the purposes of the commission is the village. The above discussion however has been entered into to show the absurd results which would follow from the Mysore Government's arguments.

61. *Rani Channamma*.— The following is not given as a hardship, but is an indication of how the wind blows and how certain things are done which unnecessarily rouse sentiments. The Mysore Government has recently started a propoganda in respect of Rani Channamma. She is represented as a great fighter against British imperialism. She lived at Kittur in the Sampgaon Taluka of the Belgaum District. Two large panels, each about 15 feet by 7 feet, are placed by the road side at Kittur for the

benefit of travellers the writing on one panel being in English and on the other panel in Kannad. Annexure L shows the English writing on the panel. In a prominent square in the Belgaum town is placed an equestrian statue of the Rani. A statement which is prominently displayed elsewhere for the benefit of travellers says that she fought the British 33 years before the Rani of Jhansi.

62. The history of the Belgaum District as given in the District Gazetteer or the Imperial Gazetteer does not appear to support the very high claims made for the above lady in regard to her independence of spirit and fighting qualities. She is not even referred to in the Gazetteer as a Rani. The Marathi-speaking people yet can have no complaint if the Mysore Government wishes to rewrite history with a view to create a symbol which will inspire the Kannad-speaking people. But the attempt is clearly to compare Rani Channamma with the Rani of Jhansi and the statement that the former lived 33 years before the latter is clearly intended to tell the Marathi-speaking people that "you are not the only fighting people. We have produced patriots and warriors before you did." The propriety of having the equestrian statue at Belgaum, which is the only town in the State with a Marathi atmosphere, is not clear. There is no similar statue even in the State capital of Bangalore. The administrator of the defunct Belgaum Municipality recently donated a sum of Rs. 25,000 from the Municipal funds to a Committee of Celebrations concerned with Rani Channamma. We have stated

all this only to show how every attempt is being made to impose a new Kannad culture on the Marathi-speaking population and it is this imposition and the competitive spirit which accompanies it that is resented by the Marathi-speaking population.

63. *How the border dispute has been dealt with since 1956, though changes brought about in situation, dispute must be decided on situation as obtained in 1956.*—It has been explained above how the S. R. C. went wrong in its report about the area referred to in paragraph 4 above. The S. R. C. report necessarily had to be based on the population figures of the 1951 census. That report being invalid as explained above, its work has to be completed now and this completion cannot be done except on the basis of the situation as obtained in 1956. That is why the Resolution of 25th October 1966 provides that its object is to solve the existing border disputes”. That word “existing” has reference only to the S. R. Act, 1956. That Act provided for Zonal Councils to consider certain disputes. The present border dispute did come before the Western Zonal Council of which both the Bombay and Mysore States were members. The Mysore State Government however protracted the consideration and decision of the dispute by the Western Zonal Council, and then the question of the Reorganisation of the Bombay State itself arose and demanded the attention of the Bombay State Government. Then came the Bombay State Reorganisation Act, 1959, and the newly formed Maharashtra State became a member of the Western Zonal Council. There was an attempt by the two Governments in 1960 to settle the dispute.

In this memorandum we are not concerned with that attempt at settlement or the reports made by the representatives of the two Governments. The point to be made here is that the present Commission is called upon to complete the work of the S. R. Act, 1956 and it should be clear that that work cannot be completed on any but the position regarding language and incidental matters as prevailed at the time of S. R. Act, 1956. We are compelled to make this point because deliberate attempts are made by the Mysore Government to alter the situation in the area described in paragraph 4 above as much as possible to the detriment of the Marathi-speaking population of that area. The officials sent to Belgaum town since 1956 and their families, though increasing the Kannad population of the town have no real interest in the Belgaum town. This is a transitory population depending upon posting and transfer in Government service. We do not wish to describe here, the various changes introduced by the Mysore Government in order to change the aspect of the town or the life of the people. But one important matter must be referred to here and that is the delimitation of constituencies. As stated already, the Samiti was able to win the elections in both the 1957 and 1962 General elections for both the Belgaum I and Belgaum II constituencies of the Belgaum Taluka. In 1957, and 1962, the Belgaum I constituency was the southern part of the taluka and Belgaum II was its northern part. For 1967 elections the position is that the delimitation. Commission has accepted the recommendations of the State Government for division of the Taluka into an Eastern Part and a Western Part for the purposes

of the two constituencies. The Delimitation Commission could not have made this change on its own initiative. The division into an eastern part and a western part was intended to secure a Kannad-speaking majority at least in one of the two constituencies. The point is that the Mysore Government should not be allowed to rely on the success of a Kannad-speaking candidate in the eastern part in 1967 elections. The 1961 census figures have not yet been published but for reasons already given the only census on which the Commission should rely is the census of 1951 and that is also the object of the resolution of 25th October 1966.

64. *The delimited eastern part of Belgaum Taluka and 1967 Elections.*—The effect of the division of the Belgaum taluka into an eastern part (now called Bagewadi) and a western part (now called Uchagaon) by the Delimitation Commission for the purposes of the 1967 elections may be explained immediately by reference to the recent election results of these two Assembly constituencies in the Belgaum taluka. As pointed out from time to time in the present memorandum the Marathi-speaking area of the Belgaum district is in the western part which adjoins the Chandgad Taluka and the coastal belt. The Marathi-speaking area of the Belgaum taluka is also thus naturally in its western part, and the portion of that taluka which is not in dispute before the Commission and which has a Kannad-speaking majority is in the eastern part of the taluka. When, therefore, the taluka was divided into western part and an eastern part by the Delimitation Commission, the eastern comprised (1)

part of the area in dispute before the commission having a Marathi-speaking majority, and (2) an area which is not in dispute before the Commission, having a Kannad-speaking majority. In 1957 and 1962 elections, when the taluka was divided into a northern and a southern part, the area having the Kannad-speaking majority was divided between the two parts, but since the taluka as a whole had also a Marathi majority, the Samiti candidates won the election in both the northern and southern parts. In 1967, the Samiti's candidate in the western part has been duly elected, and that position does not call for any more comment in this paragraph. The question is about the election in eastern part of the taluka. In that election, the Congress candidate polled 26092 votes and the Samiti candidate only 15500 votes. The Congress candidate therefore won the election. If, however, that part only of the constituency is taken into account which is included in the area in dispute before the commission, it is found that the Congress candidate secured only 7521 total votes in that part, while the Samiti candidate secured as many as 14686 total votes. The Samiti's claim in regard to the Marathi-speaking area is thus more than established, whatever the Delimitation Commission might have done. The present commission is not concerned, and is not bound by the decisions of the Delimitation Commission, just as it is not bound by the boundaries of districts and talukas as formed by the executive government of the day. In fact, in the opinion of the Samiti, the present commission will have failed to exercise its high powers and to perform its true duty, unless it carries on its work irrespective of the artificial divisions created by other

authorities, whether as districts and talukas for the purposes of revenue and law and order, or as constituencies for the purposes of elections to the legislatures. The sole concern before the commission, it has to be repeated again and again is a contiguous language tract, with the inevitable village as the primary unit of human habitation.

65. *No corresponding hardship to Kannad people if disputed area is transferred to Maharashtra.*— It will be contended for the Kannad-speaking people that there can be no true question of hardships, but if at all there are any hardships for the Marathi people, correspondingly there will be hardships for the Kannad people if the Belgaum town and other areas described in paragraph 4 above are transferred to the Maharashtra State. It will be contended that it is better to maintain the *status quo*. This argument, it is submitted, is not really correct. The Kannad minority in the said areas has lived with Marathi majority from the earliest relevant times and the minority even speaks the language of the majority as a second language. This point has been discussed already. It has been shown that the Kannad leaders not only spoke Marathi but used that language for their literary efforts. It is only the officials and their families who have been sent by Mysore Government since 1956 that may not be able to speak Marathi. But they are not going to stay in this Marathi speaking area if it goes to Maharashtra and no question of hardship to the Kannad then arises. The present hardships to the Marathi people cannot be compared with the possible hardships to the Kannad people if the Belgaum area is transferred to

Maharashtra. The two hardships are not the same in nature and extent.

66. *Educational institutions Kannad and Marathi.*— It may be contended that there are Kannad institutions in Belgaum which will suffer if the town goes to the Maharashtra State. Such an argument shows a complete unawareness of how institutions are founded or how they thrive. The Lingraj College at Belgaum was started by a Society. The name of the Society was formerly Karnatak Lingayat Education Society and latterly it has been altered to Karnatak Liberal Education Society. Now the members of this society may be Kannad-speaking persons. But they have only the management, the students of the Science and Arts Colleges come even from places outside the State and include a large number of Marathi-speaking students. An educational institution should be held to belong to the students who take advantage of it and in this case the above Belgaum institutions cannot be said to belong to Kannad-speaking people only. What belongs to the Kannad-speaking persons is the property in the buildings and the equipment of the institutions. This holding of property has no relevance to the questions at issue before the commission. In fact this holding of property and the Management of institutions has no significance for the language issue in the present conditions of the country. Some of the biggest institutions in Bombay are conducted by Tamil groups or Sindhi groups or Gujarati or Parsee or Marwari groups. A similar position obtains in other parts of the country also. The Christian Missionaries have their institutions everywhere and

all communities irrespective of religion, race or language take advantage of these institutions. We submit therefore that any argument having reference to Kannad institutions is unreal. Even if Belgaum is transferred to Maharashtra State, there will be no loss and no hardship either to the property owners or to students. We are aware that the Marathi-speaking people have in the past raised a similar contention about the R. P. D. College conducted by them. We have no hesitation in saying that there also the contentions would have been unreal, if the Mysore State Government and the Karnatak University were not giving a step-motherly treatment to that college under the mistaken notion that this college is an encroachment on the Karnatak Culture. Probably if the Mysore State Government and the Karnatak University had cared to consider who are the persons really affected by the step-motherly treatment, they would not behave in the way that they are doing.

67. There is a law college, a commerce college and even a medical college at Belgaum conducted by Kannad societies. A large number of students here are from Andhra, Kerala and so on, and what is stated above applies to them also.

68. *Flagrant instance of denial of important civil and political rights to Belgaum town merely because of its sympathy with the cause of the Marathi people.*— It is very often contended in the name of the unity of the country that it matters little whether a certain area is included in one State or the other. Such a contention presupposes that the Government of the

State deals out justice evenly between all the communities comprised in their State. The following statement in relation to the Municipality of the Belgaum town will show how the Marathi-speaking population is discriminated against. In February 1962 in a total membership of 44 of the Municipal Board 34 were Marathi, 6 were Kannad-speaking and 4 were Muslims. The term of the Municipality expired in February 1962. Fresh elections should have been held then, but this was not done. After waiting for a period of eight months, there was a writ petition to the Mysore High Court for a direction to the Deputy Commissioner to hold the elections. This petition was granted by the High Court. Government then took some time for the purpose of reconstituting the wards. It is not intended to bother the commission with the motives for such reconstitution. Elections were then held in October 1963. There were 16 wards in the town. In 4 of these wards, the nominations were rejected on the ground that the candidate concerned was not an elector in the specific ward for which he stood for election but was an elector in some other ward. Elections were thus actually held in 12 wards only. There were writ petitions to the High Court in respect of the rejection of the nomination papers in the said 4 wards. The High Court held that the rejections were illegal. This was on 23rd August 1964 when the stage was set clear for elections in the said 4 wards and they were fixed to be held on 10th October 1964, but the Government on 14th September 1964 issued an ordinance under its Emergency Powers postponing the election till the emergency lasted. The ordinance was later replaced by an Act. On 19th December 1964,

the Government appointed an official Administrator. There was one more Writ petition to the High Court that the Conditions under which the appointment could be made had not been fulfilled. This petition was upheld by the High Court, who quashed the Government order making the appointment. The Government then had the Act amended and the Amendment also provided for validation of the appointment already made. The official Administrator thus continues in office till this day. The people of Belgaum have been denied the important political right of governing their civil affairs since February 1962, the only reason for the Government action should be that the Municipality before February 1962 had several times expressed itself in favour of the Marathi speaking areas of the Mysore State including the Belgaum town being joined to the Maharashtra State. We leave the propriety of the Government action for the decision of the Commission itself.

69. *Hardships due to official language.*—The Mysore State has adopted Kannad as the official language and the commission can well imagine the hardships this has been causing to a population of about 5 lakhs. Letters and notices from all offices of the Government are in Kannad. Various forms to be submitted to Government are printed in Kannad or English. Registers and books in some cases must be maintained in Kannad and all this has been causing untold hardship to a people who never knew such treatment under the British days. Marathi has practically ceased to be a language of the Courts whatever the legal position may be. One Judicial Judge refused to accept an

application because it was in Marathi and the matter had to be represented to the District Judge who suitably explained the legal position to the other Judges. The whole situation has become very serious in the Marathi speaking area of the District. A few examples of what is happening are cited in annexure for the purpose of illustrating the points made in this paragraph.

70. *Reign of Terror for Marathi people.*—Matters have gone thus far that the Marathi speaking people are being treated as criminals and are being terrorised in a number of ways by the Government and the police. We know that this is a charge which the Mysore Government will not accept. All that we can do here is to place copies of certain reports printed from time to time in Annexure M to this Memorandum. The Commission can decide for itself whether the said reports do not establish the truth of the above charge.

II

71. *Other points raised by Resolution of 25th October 1966.*—The Resolution of 25th October 1966, as we read it, raises three points; (1) “The fundamental basis”, (2) “The existing border disputes”, and (3) “Ascertaining public opinion”. So far, we have discussed mostly the question of the fundamental basis. We referred to the various Reorganisation Acts and found that their main object was the linguistic division of States. This position was confirmed by the resolution which appointed the States Reorganisation Commission, which referred to “Language and Culture”. We examined the S. R. C. Report. We also examined the so-called administrative inconvenience and considered the question of splitting up a District or a Taluka. We also considered the various other objections raised by the Kannad people or the Mysore Government and examined the cultural aspects and the position of the different communities. It is not necessary to go over all this again. We shall now be concerned with the second and the third points as referred to above and as raised by the resolution of 25th October 1966.

72. *The said points and Mysore contentions about (a) 1961 census and (b) 1967 election.*—The two grounds on which the Mysore Government is going to place the utmost reliance will no doubt be (1) the

population figures as per the 1961 census, and (2) the 1967 election results. Both affect the question of the effect of the expression “existing border disputes”. The second affects the question of the public opinion which the Commission has to ascertain. We shall consider both the grounds below :

73. The first contention of the Samiti is that both the above grounds on which the Mysore Government would rely are incompetent, having regard to the Commission’s function under the resolution of 25th October 1966, which is to solve “Existing border disputes”. With regard to population, we have already shown how there has been an artificial increase in the Kannad-speaking population in the last ten years. The 1961 census figures are not yet available to us. We yet find it difficult to believe that the mother-tongue figures as given in the said census have not been manipulated by the Mysore Government taking advantage of its position. We say this partly from our experience in the 1967 elections and partly from the conduct of the Kannad-speaking people in 1951. In 1951 Belgaum was a Karnatak District, but the Kannada majority had not the same control over the census operations as the Mysore Government had in 1961. Yet in 1951 the Kannad people made a great agitation that the correct entries were not made about their language by the enumerators. It is true that in 1951 many enumerators inevitably were Marathi-speaking. The Kannad people used this fact for the purposes of their argument. It is enough to say here that the Census Superintendent

at that time was an Englishman and a member of the old I. C. S.; and that after a detailed investigation the said officer was completely satisfied about the correctness of the mother-tongue entries. The point is that if this was the attitude of the Kannad people in 1951, one is only left to imagine what it would be in 1961, when there is a Kannada Government with full control of the census operations and with a still unsolved border dispute, which would depend upon population figures, on their hands. The Marathi people have lost all faith in the *bona fides* of the Mysore Government wherever the border dispute and they are concerned. We may point out that in 1951 the census work was entrusted to the Municipality, but in 1961 it was done directly by Government officers. Secondly, the compilation of figures which formerly used to be done at Belgaum itself was this time done at Bangalore and thirdly, when we sometime back made inquiry at Bangalore, we were told that all the papers had gone to Delhi and that therefore we could not be supplied any information. The 1951 census figures were available to us in 1954 in a printed book when we submitted our Memorandum to the States Re-organisation Commission. It is rather strange that the 1961 census figures are not available to us even in 1966. We request therefore that the 1961 census figures should not be relied upon for any purpose and should not be allowed to be referred to for the Kannad case.

74. With regard to 1967 elections, some of the difficulties raised by the delimitation of constituencies have already been referred to in para 62 ante. In the 1957

and 1962 elections the Samiti candidates had been returned by overwhelming majorities against their Congress rivals. This time, the Mysore Congress which is a Kannad body was over-zealous in view of the appointment of the present Commission. To give one instance, in the Belgaum town, the Samiti candidate in 1962 had 14,445 votes more than his Congress rival. In 1967 the Samiti candidate had only 3,594 votes more than his Congress rival. The reduction in the difference between the votes polled by the two candidates calls for some comment. The reduction is partly due to the increase in Kannad population which is floating to a large extent and partly to faulty electoral rolls, which omitted the names of a large number of Marathi speaking persons. There was also another complication, and that was due to the clever way in which the Congress exploited the communal feelings by setting up a wealthy Jain candidate for the Assembly seat and a fairly rich Muslim candidate for the Lok Sabha seat. All Jains and Muslims speak Marathi though in some cases their first language may be different. In the previous elections, they voted for the Samiti candidate. But there is also no doubt that in 1967 election because of the community of the two Congress candidates, a considerable section of the two communities has voted for the Congress candidate. The reduction, therefore, in the difference between the

votes polled by the rival candidates cannot be ascribed to any withdrawal of support to the Samiti's cause.

75. There were many irregularities during the present elections, but we do not consider the present memorandum as a place to refer to them in detail. We would only say that the State Government took a big hand this time in helping the Congress party. All the administrative machinery was used with the single purpose of helping the Congress. Every imaginable breach of rules was made, commencing with the faulty preparation of the electoral rolls. There were numerous mal-practices, now-a-days too well known in the country, against which an opposition party has little effective remedy. The hostile attitude of the officers and some of the mal-practices were so obvious that the Marathi speaking people of the town have resented them.

77. We repeat here a view which has already been expressed that the words "Existing border disputes" would not permit the changes which have been brought about in the situation after 1956 being taken into consideration, in determining the question before the commission. No dispute can be solved finally if the facts are deliberately twisted and altered by the time that any tribunal starts the hearing of the case. If the Mysore Government tries to show by reference to 1961 census that there could be no language dispute or by referring to the 1967 elections that the public opinion is not as claimed by the Samiti, the whole situation is falsified, and the commission cannot permit the Mysore Government to do this.

78. *Results of elections to the Assembly and the Taluka Boards.*—The commission as at present consisted will not have the advantage of a direct knowledge of the Marathi climate of the entire disputed area. It is difficult to tell a person who has no such direct knowledge how and until 1956, even the non-Marathi people like the Christians, Muslims and the Kannadigas themselves lived under the influence of the Marathi climate. That is how people like late Gangadharrao Deshpande, Shri Belvi and Shri Datar thought and wrote in Marathi. Marathi was not a mere language of fashion as Kannadigas like to maintain, the whole atmosphere was full of Marathi language and culture. However much a few Kannad leaders might resent the position, they could only start an agitation in the name of ‘Karnatak’ and that is what they were doing from twenties onward. As explained already in this memorandum, the whole social life, the arts and crafts, the press and the festivals—in Belgaum they are all evidence of the Marathi climate. We shall now refer two kinds of public record of the public opinion. One is the elections to the Mysore Legislative Assembly in 1957, 1962 and 1967 and the other is elections to Local Bodies and the resolutions passed by them.

The following table sets out the five Assembly constituencies in the disputed area in the Belgaum district and votes polled by the rival candidates in the 1957, 1962 and 1967 elections respectively (Table attached) :

Mysore Legislative Assembly Elections

Constituency	1957 Elections			1962 Elections			1967 Elections		
	Votes secured by		Difference	Votes secured by		Difference	Votes secured by		Difference
	Samiti	Congress		Samiti	Congress		Samiti	Congress	
	Samiti	Congress	Difference	Samiti	Congress	Difference	Samiti	Congress	Difference
1. Belgaum City ..	22,179	15,915	+6,264	28,038	13,593	+14,445	27,818	24,224	+3,594
2. Belgaum-I(South).	18,015	12,061	+5,954	17,778	13,312	+4,466	28,066 (Uchgaon Con.)	10,543	+17,523
3. Belgaum-II(North).	17,446	15,549	+1,897	18,505	17,592	+913	15,500 (Bagewadi Con.)	26,092	+10,592
4. Khanapur ..	26,401	12,822	+13,579	25,107	14,614	+10,493	21,281	14,490	+6,791
5. Nipani ...	26,068	7,733	+18,335	27,280	9,247	+18,006	29,041	17,575	+12,446

The following table sets out the votes polled by the rival candidates in the Lok-Sabha elections 1962 for the Belgaum Parliamentary constituency from the three areas with which we are concerned, viz. The Belgaum City and the two parts of the Belgaum Taluka :—

Name of the Constituency		Votes polled by candidate supported by Samiti	Votes polled by Congress candidate	Difference
Belgaum City	..	28,294	13,607	+14,687
Belgaum II	..	19,776	14,754	+5,022
Belgaum I	...	18,913	12,184	+6,729

Elections to the Taluka Development Boards took place only once namely in 1960, and no further elections have taken place on account of "emergency" under a Mysore Act. The information given below is about 1960 elections to the Taluka Development Board of the Belgaum and Khanapur Talukas respectively :—

Name of Taluka		No. of seats	No. of seats contested by Samiti	No. of seats won by Samiti	
Belgaum	..	19	16	13	
Khanapur	..	15	13	9	
Chikodi	{	Soundalga constituency	3	3*	3
		Khadaklot constituency	3	3*	2
		Konnur constituency	3	3*	..

*Candidates supported by the Samiti.

Taluka Development Board Elections, 1960

Taluka	Name of the constituency	No. of seats	Votes polled by Samiti	Votes polled by Congress
Belgaum	(1) Uchagaon	3	19,693	837
	(2) Yellur	3	14,329	5,896
	(3) Kudachi	2	9,135	6,472
	(4) Kakati	3	11,079	2,559
	One reserved	uncontested.		
	(5) Majgaon	2	7,442	4,112
Khanapur	(1) Khanapur group	2	9,007	1,948
	(2) Nandgad group	3	17,564	7,604
	(3) Gunji group	2	9,654	685
	(4) Jamboti group	2	9,889	768

79. A few words about the Khanapur Assembly constituency election in 1967. The Samiti candidate has won the election as in 1957 and 1962 but once again the difference between the votes polled by the victorious Samiti candidate and the defeated Congress candidate is less than what it was in 1957 and 1962. This was due solely to an unfortunate dissension in the Samiti's ranks, and in addition to the official Samiti candidate, a dissenting member of the Samiti also stood as a candidate, representing himself as the true candidate of the Samiti. In the result, there were three candidates in the field, two of them using Samiti's name. The voting resulted as follows :—

- (i) The victorious Samiti candidate ... 21,281
- (ii) The Congress candidate ... 14,490
- (iii) The dissenting Samiti candidate ... 8,313

The difference in the votes polled by the Samiti and Congress candidates in 1957 and 1962 was 13,579 and

10,493 respectively. That difference in 1967 would appear to be 6,791, if the victorious official Samiti candidate and the Congress candidate are alone taken into account. If, however one considers that Samiti votes were divided between the official and the dissenting representatives, it is clear that those two representatives together polled 15,104 votes more than the Congress candidate. It is, therefore, clear that the public opinion has come out resoundingly in favour of the Samiti's platform and has expressed itself clearly against the Congress and the Kannad stand.

80. *Resolutions of Local Bodies.*—Now lastly about resolutions of Local Bodies. The Belgaum Municipality last met in 1962. It has passed several resolutions between 1955 and 1962 supporting Samiti's claim for including the disputed area in Maharashtra. The Nipani Municipality, which like Belgaum last met in 1964 has similarly passed several resolutions to the same effect.

The Belgaum and Khanapur Taluka Boards have also passed similar resolutions more than once, though each time a resolution was passed, it was disallowed by the authorities concerned on the ground that it was not competent.

The Grampanchayats in the disputed area have passed resolutions urging for the inclusion of their areas in Maharashtra.

III

81. *Inclusion of 4 specified villages in Samiti's claim.*—Annexures 'A' and 'B' to this Memorandum show the area claimed by the Samiti in the Belgaum Taluka. The particular villages included in this area and their boundaries are also clearly shown in the maps. The question which will arise for the Commission will be the contiguity within itself of the entire area claimed by the Samiti. In the consideration of that question, the case for the claim for 4 villages which are numbered 8, 9, 14 and 15 in the map. The area to the west of these four villages is a compact Marathi majority block and there is no doubt of the Samiti's claim with regard to that block. Then to the east of the said four villages is a block consisting of the following nine villages, that is numbers 7, 10, 40, 41, 50, 53, 54, 55 and 76. The Marathi speaking in each of the nine villages is more than 50 per cent. Specifically the percentage of Marathi speaking population is as follows :

No.	Name of village	Percentage		
		Population	Marathi	Kannad
7	Nilji	1,184	93·0	5·7
10	Kalkhamb	1,476	62·3	35·0
40	Mutge	2,424	67·0	29·8
41	Sambre	3,495	58·0	36·4
50	Khangao Kh.	785	80·9	12·4
53	Chandgad	606	68·2	30·5
54	Ashte	1,248	59·4	33·6
55	Muchandi	2,048	65·7	32·1
76	Basarikatti	947	85·5	12·9
	Total	14,213		

82. As stated already, there can be no doubt about the Samiti's claim to any of the said nine villages, where Marathi is the predominant language. But now we have to consider the case of the four villages to which reference has been made above, namely 8, 9, 14 and 15. The population and mother-tongue percentages are as follows :

No.	Name of village	Population	Percentage	
			Marathi	Kannad
8	Kudchi ..	2,548	26.2	73.4
9	Kanabargi ..	3,580	31.1	66.3
14	Yamanapur ..	544	31.3	65.8
15	Kakati ..	2,925	42.9	50.2
	Total ..	9,609		

83. The Samiti's claim to the said four villages rests on the following grounds :

(1) The total population of the two blocks of four villages and nine villages is 23,822, of which 12,822 or 53.8 per cent are Marathi and 10,122 or 42.0 per cent are Kannad. The Marathi language still predominates even if the two blocks are taken together.

(2) In India communities settle in villages according to caste or language. In a big town also there are distinct and separate localities inhabited by Brahmins, Marathas, Lingayats, Christians and Muslims and Harijans or Marathi, Kannad and Urdu peoples. In rural areas, what is a locality in a big town may form a separate whole village. Marathi and Kannad may thus alternate. Where

however it is found that the whole tract has a Marathi predominance, the presence of a few Kannad villages within that tract does not alter the character and description of that tract as a Marathi speaking one. This is exactly what has happened in the present case.

(3) The truth of the above ground will be seen from the fact that village No. 7, Nilji which is absolutely adjacent to village No. 8, Kudchi has a Marathi percentage of 93, which shows how overwhelming it is Marathi. Yet it is adjacent to the village Kudchi, which has a majority of Kannad people, though by no means as overwhelming as the Marathi people in Nilji. Village No. 10 Kalakhamb which is adjacent to village No. 9 Kanabargi, has a Marathi population of 63 per cent. The next adjacent village Nos. 55, 54, 53 and 50, and in that order have a Marathi percentage of 65·7, 59·4, 68·2 and 80·9. The last mentioned of these villages shows conclusively that the tract must be regarded as a Marathi speaking one, notwithstanding the existence of the village No. 9 with only a 31·1 Marathi percentage.

(4) The villages No. 8 Kudchi, No. 9 Kanabargi, and No. 15 Kakati have expressed their opinion through their Grampanchayats in favour of merger with Maharashtra. Village No. 14 Yamanapur forms a group Gram panchayat with two other villages No. 11 Kangrali Bk. and No. 13 Gowdwad, and the group Grampanchayat has expressed its opinion in favour of merger with Maharashtra. In fact village No. 14 has a very small population and that is

why it has been joined to the villages Nos. 11 and 13 to form a group panchayat. Therefore the existence of the village like No. 14 cannot be regarded as having any significance for the question at issue.

(5) In village No. 8 Kudchi the number of Marathi and Kannad members of the panchayat respectively in the Grampanchayat is equal. It is also relevant to point out here that the resolution passed by the Kudchi grampanchayat states that the Marathi people are in a majority in the village.

(6) Village No. 41 Sambra is admittedly in the Marathi block given above, Sambra has an aerodrome and it is an air port for I.A.C. services. It, thus, has important connections with the Belgaum town and Cantonment only a few miles away. In view of these connections Sambra cannot be separated from the Belgaum town and Cantonment, merely because of the intervening village No. 8 Kudchi. In fact village No. 8 Kudchi is only one of three intervening villages, the two other being No. 7, Nilji and No. 40 Mutge, and these two latter villages are admittedly in the Marathi Block. For all these reason village No. 8 should not be held as breaking the continuity of the Marathi tract.

84. For all the said grounds the Samiti submits that villages Nos. 8, 9, 14 and 15 have to be included in Maharashtra.

IV

85. *Incident in Belgaum on 23rd February 1967 during the visit of the Commission.*—Before we close, we cannot but refer here the incident which took place during the night of the 23rd February, and during the visit of the present Commission to Belgaum. On the 23rd February the results of the election in the Belgaum Taluka Bagewadi Constituency had been declared and the successful candidate was a congressman. The result of the Belgaum Loksabha Constituency election had not yet been declared but the counting had almost been completed and there never had been any doubt about the success of the Congress candidate for Loksabha. At about 10-30 p.m. a big crowd of Congress supporters entered the Marathi Harijan Localities and a few Marathi houses in a neighbouring Kannad locality, all in that part of the Belgaum Town which is called Khasbag. The grouse of the Congress supporters was that the Harijans and others had not only voted for the Harijan Republican Party candidate for Loksabha as against the Congress, but had also voted for the Samiti candidate for the Assembly Constituency. The crowd of Congress supporters attacked the said Harijan and other houses, threw stones at and injured many persons and belaboured many, all the said persons including woman and children also. One old Harijan woman was seriously injured. The assemblage of the congress crowd and its attack took place inspite of the order under section 35 of the

Mysore Police Act which was in force since 20th February. The Congress crowd and its attack was immediately reported to the Superintendent of Police. He sent a police force under one Sub-Inspector Channappa. The arrival of the police force at about midnight added only fuel to the fire. The Congress crowd by this time had dispersed. But the police on arrival started belabouring such Marathi persons as they met and entered the houses of those persons who were Samiti workers and beat them and arrested them. The terrorising by the police was of a kind wholly brutal and altogether unnecessary. No action whatever was taken and no investigation was made about the aggressors. No attention was paid to the old woman who was seriously injured. The police thus retired taking away with them the eight arrested persons. The Samiti is not aware what report Sub-Inspector Channappa has made to his superiors and what record has been made by the Police Department of the whole incident. It will be useful for the Commission to call for and look into the record, because it is bound to show the degree of falsification which an interested governmental agency can make. It is difficult to believe that such terror from the police can take place in a civilized society. Probably the explanation is that the Government servants believe that any action against the Marathi speaking people only pleases the Government.

V

86. Many other hardships are collected together and stated in Annexure N for the information of the Commission. The Memoranda submitted by the Samiti to (i) the States Reorganisation Commission, and (ii) the Four Man Committee appointed in 1960 by the two Governments of Mysore and Maharashtra are annexed hereto as Annexures O and P respectively, and they may be treated as part of this Memorandum, since some matters stated there have not been included in the present Memorandum. Similarly, certain points raised in the Report of the Mysore Representatives on the Maharashtra-Mysore Border Disputes Committee have been met with in Annexure Q. Some other relevant papers are also made annexures hereto and they may kindly be seen (Annexures R to FF).

B. R. SUNTHANKAR,
President,
Maharashtra Ekikaran Samiti,
Belgaum.

Belgaum, dated 26th February 1967.

**LIST OF THE ANNEXURES APPENDED TO THE
MEMORANDUM SUBMITTED BY THE MAHA-
RASHTRA EKI KARAN SAMITI, BELGAUM**

- A. Six maps showing the disputed area—
- (1) Map showing the entire disputed area.
 - (2) Map of Khanapur taluka showing the area claimed by the Samiti.
 - (3) Map of Belgaum taluka showing the area claimed by the Samiti.
 - (4) Map of Chikodi taluka showing the area claimed by the Samiti.
 - (5) Map of Hukeri taluka showing the area claimed by the Samiti.
 - (6) Map of Athani taluka showing the area claimed by the Samiti.
- B. Population figures of the area claimed by Samiti.
- C. Extract from Kesari, dated 23rd October 1955.
- D. Map showing Natural Regions of the Belgaum district.
- E. Extract from the Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute.
- E1. Extracts from the “Resources of Maratha History” and “Maharashtra in Yadavas Times”.
- F. Sale of Journals and periodicals in Belgaum City.
- G. (1) Notification No. 2005 of 1874, dated 8th April 1874.
(2) Notification No. 2358 of 1874, dated 23rd April 1874.
(3) Notification No. G. N. of D. No. 5933 of 10th November 1908.

- (4) Notification No. 2433/2 of 29th September 1927.
- (5) Letter regarding Official language from Collector of Belgaum to the Chief Secretary, Bombay, dated 12th September 1950.
- H. Import and Export trade of Belgaum with Ratnagiri district.
- I. Export trade of Belgaum town.
- J. Imports in Belgaum town.
- K. Statement regarding Small Scale and Large Scale Industries of Belgaum district.
- L. Rani Kittur Channamma.
- M. Atrocities of Mysore Police.
- N. Hardships and disabilities of Marathi people in Mysore State.
- O. Belgaum City Memorandum submitted by the Samiti to S. R. C.
- P. Memorandum submitted by the Samiti to the Four-Man Committee.
- Q. Replies to points made out in the Report of Mysore Representatives.
- R. Copy of the Memorandum submitted to the Four-Man Committee by the Belgaum Municipality.
- S. An appeal against S. R. C.
- T. Maharashtra's claim on the Marathi-speaking areas of Belgaum and Karwar.
- U. Why satyagraha — letter to Pandit Jawaharlal.
- V. The Voice of Belgaum by Three M.L.A.s.
- W. An appeal to democracy by Vidyarthi Sangh.
- X. Belgaum pleads for democracy by Prof. R. S. Rege.

- Y. Memorandum by the Local Bodies—Belgaum Municipality and Belgaum Taluka.
- Z. Appeal (in Marathi) at the time of the Collective fast before the A. I. C. C. on 15th May 1964.
- AA. Report of indefinite fast for the solution of the Border problem (Marathi pamphlet).
- BB. Belgaum—Linguistic statistics—1951 Census.
- CC. Memorandum submitted to the Dar Commission by the Maharashtra Ekikaran Samiti, Belgaum.
- DD. An open letter to the President, the Prime Minister, the Union Home Minister and Members of Parliament on behalf of the elected representatives in the disputed area.
- EE. Extract from an article written by Taya Zinkin in the *Manchester Guardians*, dated 2nd May 1960.
- FF. In Defence of Fundamental Cultural Rights — the case of the R. P. D. College, Belgaum.

**Memorandum in continuation of and supplementary to
the Memorandum, dated 26th February 1967,
previously submitted to the Commission by
the Maharashtra Ekikaran Samiti, Belgaum**

MEMORANDUM

The following memorandum is in continuation of and supplementary to the memorandum, dated 26th February 1967, previously submitted to the Commission by the Maharashtra Ekikaran Samiti, Belgaum.

1. In the application of the principle of the wishes of the people to the formation of States, one salient point has to be remembered to appreciate the present situation in its real perspective. There are many in the country who hold, and honestly too, that language will not be a good basis for the formation of States. They point their finger to the linguistic controversies that are raging in different States and argue that they are apt to affect the national integrity. A little looking back at the development of linguistic principle, however, may clarify the issue.

2. The British Government when it came here, had no interest in the development of any Indian languages. The administrative language was English, but it could reach only a few people. But a vague idea of self-government arose in the masses and grew gradually. This idea could find expression only in the language or languages actually spoken by the people. The patriotic feeling, when thus expressed in the languages of the people, also awakened a language consciousness and developed a particular sentiment for the languages spoken in their respective regions. The British soon became conscious "of the phenomenal development of regional languages in the 19th century,

which led to an emotional integration of different language groups and the development amongst them of a consciousness of being distinct cultural units." This emotional integration and consciousness of being distinct cultural units is a fact and no amount of sophisticated opinions can alter it.

3. Trouble has arisen only after independence, because we have not been able to substitute any one national language like Hindi for the official language which has previously been in use, namely, English. These three facts cannot be ignored, namely, (1) that the people of the country have diverse languages, (2) that we have accepted federal form of Constitution, which confirms considerable freedom on the States, and (3) that we have not yet been able to evolve a single national language which is spoken by all. This naturally gave impetus to the growth of the regional languages and they hold away in their own regions. The inevitable result was the growing demand for carrying on administration in the regional languages. It is, thus, precisely the administrative convenience itself which calls for States being formed on linguistic basis. It is, thus, also precisely in the interest of administrative convenience and also national integrity that the area now in dispute should be joined to the State of Maharashtra. It is manifestly absurd to contend that the transfer of the said area from the State of Mysore to that of Maharashtra will harm the country's interest in any way. This absurd position was due to political reasons and not to any linguistic, social, administrative or economic conditions. This has been amply proved in the present memorandum while discussing

the Report of the S. R. C. We hope and trust that the present Commission will take into consideration the facts alone as referred to above. The reference to this Commission itself rules out all such political considerations.

4. The previous memorandum has made it clear how the disputed area is from every point of view Marathi-language, culture, atmosphere, economic affinities, etc. The Mysore Government is not treating the Marathi-speaking people of this area as just a minority like any other minority in the State. The Marathi-speaking people are meted out a specially harsh and discriminating treatment by the State Government and there is a deliberate attempt to destroy not only the language and culture of the Marathi people, but their spirit as well. Reference has been made in paragraph 85 from the previous memorandum to a certain police terrorisation on the night of the 23rd February 1967. It is now intended to state only briefly a little further development of the same incident. On the 24th February 1967, the following persons went and saw, first the Superintendent of Police, Belgaum, and then the Deputy Commissioner, Belgaum. The said persons were (1) Shri B. R. Sunthankar, President of the Maharashtra Ekikaran Samiti, (2) Shri B. B. Saynak, who had been declared on the previous day as elected from the Belgaum City Constituency to the Mysore Legislative Assembly, (3) Shri Baburao Thakur, Editor of "Tarun Bharat" a Marathi Daily published in the Belgaum City and (4) Dr. A. G. Yalgi, a Medical Practitioner and ex-President of the Belgaum City Municipality. All these

four persons told the two Government Officers only that certain incidents had taken place during the night before and requested that a proper inquiry might be made into the incidents. On the 28th February a deputation of about 50 citizens waited upon the Deputy Commissioner. A copy of the "Tarun Bharat" issue of 1st March is annexed hereto as Annexure 'A' and it gives the details of what the various deputations said. We are concerned just now of the Deputy Commissioner's reply and the following is an English rendering of the report in the Tarun Bharat :—

'The Deputy Commissioner said in reply, "Those who have suffered from the lathi charge should immediately lodge their complaints." He then proceeded to say, "Our duty as Government servants is to maintain law and order. We are not concerned with the language, caste or religion of a citizen, nor also with whether he is poor or rich. We recognise them only as citizens. If anyone commits an offence, there will be legal action against him. We are the servants of the Government of India. We must do our duty accordingly. That is our opinion. Elections will come and go. Some will win them, some lose, we are not concerned with them. Our duty as Officers is to see that the peace and good Government of the country is not affected. That is also your duty. The life of every individual is valuable, be he poor or rich, small or big. As officers we must treat them equally. I have heard your side, I have not heard the other side. Even so, I assure you that such incidents will not take place again. I also will make an enquiry into this matter

and convey my opinion to the appropriate authorities”.

5. The Samiti will not make any comment here on the impartial and judicial attitude which the Deputy Commissioner tried to take in his above reply with respect to the elections. But there was before him a specific accusation with regard to incidents on the night of 23rd February, he had promised on 24th February that he would make an enquiry and yet he tells the people on 28th February : “ I have not heard the other side—Anyone who has suffered from the lathi charge can lodge a complaint.” The question is whether that is all that a civilised Government is expected to do. And, in this case, who was ‘ the other side ’ ? The accusation was against the Police. Did the Deputy Commissioner mean the Police or he meant the Kannad people or the Congressmen. If it was the Kannad people or the Congressmen, why was he thinking of them at all ? His duty as Government was to make an enquiry about the truth of the accusation against the Police action. Such enquiries are always made in the country, whether they may be of administrative nature or a judicial nature. Can the Deputy Commissioner say after a four day inquiry that he has not yet heard ‘ the other side ’, whoever that other side may be ? Did the Deputy Commissioner admit the truth of the accusation, when he said that “ such incidents will not take place again ” ? It appears to the Samiti that it was difficult for the Deputy Commissioner to say outright that the accusations against the Police were false. The Samiti in paragraph 85 of its previous memorandum has already observed that “ It will be useful

for the Commission to call for and look into the record, because it is bound to show the degree of falsification which an interested Government agency can make". The Samiti believes that the record will give a complete lie to the high sounding and vague statements made by the Deputy Commissioner.

In any case we have no doubt that the Deputy Commissioner's reply was most inadequate in response to the request of the citizens and could have proceeded only from an unsympathetic Government.

6. There could be no better evidence of the Marathi language, life and atmosphere of the Belgaum town than is to be found in the pages of the autobiography of the greatest leader and exponent of the Karnatak cause, the late Shri Gangadharrao Deshpande, who was known as the 'Lion of Karnatak'. Some reference to this autobiography has already been made in the memorandum previously submitted to the Commission, but it is necessary to look into that autobiography a little more here, because it affords evidence, which cannot be challenged by anybody in the country. Shri Deshpande died in 1960, but the autobiography was written long before that, when Shri Deshpande was in prison in the year 1932. The autobiography also stops with the story of Shri Deshpande's life till about 1925. The story is thus untainted with the States' Reorganisation controversy as it developed in the country after 1947. Before 1947, there was a notion of "Karnatak" and also a notion that the Belgaum District as a whole was a part of Karnatak. But there never was the question before 1947 of transferring any portion of the Belgaum District, as it has arisen before

the S. R. C. and before the present Commission. The autobiography is thus free from the present prejudices.

7. The Deshpande family comes from Hudli, a village in the Kannad area of the Belgaum Taluka and the family is admittedly a Kannad family. Shri Deshpande was born in 1871. His father was a practising lawyer in the Belgaum town. Shri Deshpande gives the following account of his early education :—

“ Although the language of our village is Kannad, the correspondence, deeds, accounts etc. were kept in Marathi only. Kannad also was taught. Most male members of the Deshpande family could read and write in both Kannad and Marathi. Even So, from the beginning I was taught only the Marathi alphabet. When I was put to School in Belgaum, it was in a Marathi School. I talked in Marathi at home with my mother, father, grandmother and sister. At Hudli, I talked in Kannad with servants, tenants etc.” (pages 16-17).

On page 120 of the book Shri Deshpande observes ; “ the idea of unifying Karnatak had started, because of the efforts of certain persons from Dharwar”. At page 129 Shri Deshpande refers to Shri Tilak’s advice to him on an occasion when he said that he would like to work in Karnatak : “ If that is so, then you will have to practice speaking Kannad”. In 1916, there was a Belgaum District Conference at Athani. Shri Deshpande states “ the reception Committee at Athani elected Khadilkar for the Presidentship and also honoured many Maharashtrians by inviting them. This hurt some protagonists of Karnatak. Some censured

the Athani Reception Committee for taking out Tilak and Khadilkar in procession, but not doing the same in respect of leaders of Karnatak. I know from hearsay that a Kannad-Marathi controversy was smouldering at Dharwar. I thought that the controversy must have arisen because of disputes in some local matters. But I had no idea that the roots of this controversy had gone so deep." (page 294).

8. A little before the Nagpur Congress of 1920, Shri Deshpande and another Kannad leader, Shri Majli, went to Dharwar to hold a meeting there. The following account is instructive: "There an unexpected thing happened. Some persons at Dharwar were enthusiastic about the Kannad language. They considered that because Marathi was predominant in a certain part of Karnatak, the Kannad language was not getting any scope. They had decided not to allow Kannad people to speak Marathi in Karnatak. They had planned to make the first experiment in my case. Some prominent persons from among them had seen me at the place where I stayed. I had had the usual talk with them. But they gave no clue to me (of their intention). Before that my speeches at Dharwar had been in Marathi and no one had taken any objection to that. Hence there was no cause for suspicion of the plan as above. Furthermore, the subject was new and I would have found it difficult to express myself in Kannad. Also my Kannad-speaking friend Shri Majli was with us. Therefore, there was nothing improper in discoursing on the subject in both the languages. If I had received previous intimation, I would have spoken in Kannad itself. The condition

at Belgaum is different. Many people attend a meeting there who do not know Kannad. Hence Marathi is necessary there. That is not the case of Dharwar. One can say that there are practically no people there who do not know Kannad. Hence I would have agreed that it was preferable to speak Kannad at Dharwar. But as I did not know of the plan to boycott Marathi in this way, I began my speech in Marathi. Before I had uttered one or two sentences.....the meeting was broken.” (page 333). This was in the evening. Subsequently Shri Deshpande was persuaded to hold another meeting at a different place. He did so the same night. “The meeting went on for nearly three hours. My speech was in Marathi and people heard it in peace”. (page 334).

9. Then came the formation of Congress Provinces and of the Karnatak Provincial Congress Committee. Shri Deshpande's observations are relevant :

“The Marathi language is in use in the Belgaum District. In some part both Marathi and Kannad are in use. The boundaries of Kolhapur, Sawantwadi and other Maharashtra (native) States touch the Belgaum district. The Goa Boundary has also met the Belgaum District. At the head-quarter of the district—the Belgaum town—Kannad and Marathi are both in use, but the predominance of Marathi is clear. Hence some Maharashtra enthusiast thought that a part of the Belgaum District should be joined to Maharashtra. But my opinion was that as the Kannad area was bigger than the Marathi area in the Belgaum District it was not proper to divide the

district into separate Marathi and Kannad parts. The people who thought there should be two parts were at Chikodi, Nipani, Khanapur, Shahapur etc. I personally went to each of those places, persuaded them after private discussions and did not allow the controversy to increase. According to the constitution of the Congress Kannad had been decided as the language of the province of Karnatak and that was proper. But having regard to the peculiar condition of the Belgaum district, both the Marathi and Kannad languages were allowed to be used in the meetings held on behalf of the Congress. This arrangement was in accordance with the previous practice.” (pages 341-342).

10. Finally an incident at the Congress Session in Belgaum in 1924. It was proposed in the entertainment Committee to have musical programmes by Sambmurty, a celebrated Andhra Singer, Vishnu Digambar Paluskar, a noted Maharashtrian singer and some well known singers of Karnatak from Mysore. But as Shri Deshpande states, “the Chairman of the Committee, Mudvedkar, said that it was derogatory to Karnatak to have a programme of singers from any province except Karnatak.” (page 409). Sambmurty and Paluskar were thus not invited in the Congress Session.

11. The above extracts from Shri Deshpande’s autobiography are enough to prove the hollowness of many Kannad contentions and the truth and justice of the Marathi case. The Marathi people and the Marathi language were already there in the disputed

area even before 1871. The Marathi people were in the majority in the disputed area and the minority there not only spoke Marathi but carried on business also in the same language. In a Kannad area like Dharwar, the Marathi people were in a minority, but spoke Kannad as a second language. There was no reason for any "consciousness" or aggressive activity in the disputed area on the part of the Marathi people. The aggressiveness arose outside the disputed area at Dharwar and spread from there. When the Congress Provinces were formed it was Shri Deshpande's personal influence, which prevented any agitation by the Marathi people for exclusion of the Marathi part from the Congress Karnatak and inclusion of the same in the Congress Maharashtra. It is not only that the above extracts from Shri Deshpande's book establish the *bona fides* and the truth and justice of the Marathi case, they also prove that the Maharashtrians are no immigrants here, that the "moving frontiers", if any, to use an expression invented by certain Kannad writers of late, come from the Karnatak side and not from Maharashtra side, and whatever aggressive quality has been shown in this entire history is on the part of the Kannad people themselves.

12. So many people have taken part in the dispute which is now before the Commission and from so many points of view, that the real issue had become confused. The population of the Belgaum town (including Shahapur) according to the 1951 census is given as follows :

Marathi-speaking	...	53.4 per cent
Kannad-speaking	...	24.9 per cent
Others	...	22.7 per cent

The others as given above include Urdu, Konkani, Hindi, Gujarati, etc. Now the Urdu language would be mentioned in the census in respect of the Muslim population only. The Muslims constitute about 15 per cent of the population. Everybody knows that the Urdu which the Muslims of Belgaum claim to speak is no pure Urdu at all. It is just like Marathi using Urdu inflections. This mixed Urdu can be classified only as Marathi. The present question before the Commission is not as to religion or race, faith, creed or castes. It is as to language. And whatever the Muslims profess, the language which they speak must be treated as Marathi for all practical purposes. In any case in a linguistic formation of States, Muslims of Belgaum at least must be classified with people who speak the Marathi language. We have referred before to the Muslim education in Belgaum. Their primary schools are Urdu-Marathi.

13. The Christians in Belgaum would be speaking English or Marathi or Kannad or Konkani. A sizable percentage of the Christian population comes from Goa and they may profess Marathi, Konkani or English. We cannot urge too strongly before the Commission that Konkani also is just Marathi. The claim that Konkani is distant from Marathi arose only because of the Portuguese rule in Goa. Konkani is a spoken language and is spoken in the Ratnagiri District also, but no claim has ever been raised there as has been raised in the Portuguese Goa. It is, therefore, submitted that a sizable portion of Christian population in Belgaum should be classified for the purposes of the present Commission along with the

Marathi-speaking population. As for the other languages such as Gujarati and Hindi, they are akin to Marathi and they have adopted Marathi for their day-to-day offers. Taking into account all these facts, the Marathi-speaking population of Belgaum is very much larger than 53·4 per cent. It will approximate 75 per cent.

B. R. SUNTHANKAR,
President,
Maharashtra Ekikaran Samiti, Belgaum.

Belgaum,

Dated 24th March 1967.



Government Central Press, Bombay.

**SECOND SUPPLEMENT
TO THE
MEMORANDUM
ON
MAHARASHTRA-MYSORE
BORDER DISPUTE
TO
THE COMMISSION
ON
MAHARASHTRA—MYSORE—KERALA
BOUNDARY DISPUTES**

1967

**MAHARASHTRA EKIKARAN SAMITI
BELGAUM**

**Second Supplement to the Memorandum on
Maharashtra-Mysore Border Dispute to the
Commission on Maharashtra-Mysore-Kerala
Boundary Disputes**

From :

B. R. Sunthankar,
President,
Maharashtra Ekikaran Samiti,
Belgaum.

To

Shri Meher Chand Mahajan,
Chairman,
Commission on Maharashtra-Mysore-Kerala
Boundary Disputes,
New-Delhi-1.

Sir,

In continuation of the Memoranda previously submitted to the Commission on behalf of the Maharashtra Ekikaran Samiti, I beg again to submit the following for your kind and earnest consideration. I request you most sincerely to forgive me for this fresh written statement on behalf of the Samiti after the lengthy memoranda previously submitted and the most considerate interviews granted by you to us during your visit to Belgaum from 23rd March to 26th March 1967. Some points arose during the various discussions and the Samiti is most anxious to place before you its views on them for your kind consideration. The expression of these views is all the more necessary, since the Maharashtra Government has not yet submitted its statement to the Commission. I shall yet try not to say anything which has already been said in the previous memoranda,

2. For the purpose of ascertaining public opinion, you granted interviews to numerous bodies and individuals during your visit. You are aware of the limitations of this method for ascertaining public opinion. The right persons frequently do not appear, a right person even when he appears sometimes says the wrong thing, sometimes it is the wrong person who appears to support a cause, and even a right person very often has not the expression or the manner which will convince a third party. Furthermore, there is always the suspicion that some persons appear due to outside pressures and not entirely out of their own volition. We do not intend to discourse on such limitations of the method of interviews. All that the Samiti is anxious to say is that the truth and the justice of its cause should not be judged by any shortcomings on the part of the persons who have appeared, either on behalf of the Samiti or independently to support its cause. The truth and justice of the cause should be determined only on the basis of principle.

3. A point which arose frequently during the discussions was whether the commission should be guided by the 1951 census figures or by the 1961 census figures. It appears to the Samiti that a proper consideration of the word "existing" in the resolution of 25th October 1966 in relation to disputes should afford an unmistakable clue to the elucidation of the point. When the Government used the word "existing" it must be considered to have done so deliberately and with a definite meaning in its mind. One of the dictionary meanings of the word "exist" is "continue in being", and the word "continue"

there shows a relation to the past. What the clause in the resolution thus means is that the dispute exists from a time prior to 25th October 1966. It is necessary to state further what the prior time is.

4. The States Re-organisation Act of 1956 formed the State of Mysore by unifying the scattered Kannad speaking areas. In this act of formation a big tract was dissected from the former Bombay State and added to Mysore. This work was avowedly a rough one as the details of demarcating the boundaries was left by a special provision in the Act to the Zonal Council as there existed disputes, which could not be resolved without a further investigation. So far as Maharashtra-Mysore and Kerala are concerned this very function has now been devolved on the present Commission. This is what is designated by the word "existing" in the resolution of 25th October 1966. The prior time implied in the word "existing" could be only 1956.

5. This function of demarcating the boundaries is the remainder of the one entrusted to the S.R.C. The recommendations of that commission are based entirely on the 1951 census figures. It will be in the interest of justice, therefore, to finish the remaining work on the same basis. Resort to any other basis would necessarily lead to injustice.

If the dispute to be considered by the commission is one which has existed from 1956, then in the opinion of the Samiti, the Commission cannot take into account things which are subsequent to 1956 and change the nature of the dispute as it was in 1956. The dispute in 1956 was based on language statistics, and that means the census figures of 1951. Furthermore, the

question is what is the reference to the Commission ? If one looks at the political history of the Resolution of 25th October 1966, it is clear that the 1961 census or its implication, were never discussed. What was throughout being discussed was the dispute which arose in 1956 on the enactment of the S. R. Act based on the 1951 census figures. There is thus reason to say that the commission would be going beyond its function in taking into account the 1961 census figures. The mother-tongue figures based on the 1961 census were not only not before the public on 25th October 1966, they were not even in the mind of the people who decided upon the appointment of the present commission. The Samiti is hence of the view that it is the 1951 census figures and not the 1961 census figures which decide the issue before the Commission.

6. The ordinary principle of justice is that a decision ought to be given on the facts and the circumstances as they exist at the date of the dispute and no notice should be taken of the events which have happened after such date. The instant dispute, dated back to 1956. Justice requires the same to be decided on the conditions as they existed then. Furthermore it is to be noted that the Mysore Government has taken unfair advantage of the time that passed after 1956 to effect deliberate changes in those conditions to create circumstances which would help them in getting a decision in their favour on the border dispute which was all the time pending. Allowing 1961 census figures any scope in the present investigation would amount to allowing the Mysore Government to reap an unfair gain of their purposeful acts.

The events subsequent to 1956 is a long story of the deliberate attempts of the Mysore Government of changing the linguistic composition of the Belgaum City to suit their purpose. The decrease in the Marathi population and increase in the Kannad population are due to these attempts. The immediate effect of the S. R. Act was the influx of a considerable number of Kannadigas in the shape of Government employees in the various departments such as Revenue, Police, Judicial, Health, Hospital, etc. In the educational institutions formed by the Kannadigas, the tutorial staff and students are from the areas in the south. These immigrants shifted to this place with their families. This addition in the population has got to be treated as a floating one and has got to be discarded from consideration. This artificial change in the figures of population cannot be taken into account for the purpose of the present dispute. The 1951 Census would, therefore, be a sure guide to decide the dispute.

7. Some point arose during the discussions that the population of the Belgaum city and some surrounding areas has increased since 1951 and that it would be wrong not to take into account this increase in the population. The mother-tongue figures are still not available to the Samiti, and the Samiti's comments on the same must be reserved till they are available. The Samiti has, however, obtained the "First figures" as they are called of the 1961 census, giving the total population only of the district, talukas, cities and towns. The Belgaum Municipal Area (including Shahapur and the Cantonment area had

respectively a population of 1,01,038 and 16,676 in 1951. That gives a total of 1,17,714, although in the said 'first figures' it is mentioned as 1,20,332. Anyway in 1961 the figures of the Municipal area (including Shahapur) and the Cantonment are 1,26,727 and 18,932 respectively, giving a total of 1,45,659. The percentage increase for the last mentioned figures over 1951 is given as 21 per cent. in 'First Figures'. The same publication also shows that Hubli had a 31.3 per cent. rise over 1951. The rise in the population of Belgaum is thus amply proved to be just a natural rise, and there need be no special consideration of any arithmetical growth in the population. In fact, the Samiti has reason to consider that, if Belgaum had been put in Maharashtra instead of Mysore in 1956, the rise in population would have been something higher, but that is another question. The Samiti is hence of the view that there is no real increase in the population of Belgaum which calls for a special consideration, and that no special problem arises for the commission's consideration because of any rise in population in 1961.

8. The Resolution of 29th December 1953, which appointed the States Re-organisation Commission mentioned "Language and culture of an area" as the Prime factor for consideration and we, too, have considered the language and culture of the area as the "fundamental basis" for the purposes of the Resolution of 25th October 1966. Now, language relates to culture and gives rise to it, but is yet, which is obvious also independent of culture. It has been our contention that apart from any language statistics, the culture of the Belgaum Town and the other disputed area is overwhelmingly if not exclusively,

a Marathi culture as distinguished from a Kannad culture. This Marathi culture brings within its perview not only the Marathi speaking Hindus but the Jains, the Muslims, the Christians and other communities. It is well known that it was only in consequence of the Muslim League politics and propaganda in the pre-independence years that the Muslims in the country began to consider that they had an independent language and that that language was Urdu. This fact can be illustrated from what took place in other States also, for example Bengal. We have already stated that it is impossible to describe the language of Musalmans of Belgaum as Urdu. In vocabulary and form it resembles Marathi more than Urdu. The commission is not concerned with the religions of the people of this area, and it would be somewhat unrealistic for the purposes of "Language" not to regard the Muslims in the same way as the Hindus who openly profess Marathi. We are not concerned here with the question what state the Muslims prefer, whether Mysore or Maharashtra. The Muslims in the present condition of the country would like to be known as the friends of the ruling party. A preference for the Mysore State, even when expressed, has little value. They will be equally happy with any other State. The main question is the state of their language, of their culture.

9. We may next consider what is really meant by "language" for the purposes of the present commission. The Commission is appointed in connection with States Re-organisation, and we should look to the provisions of the Constitution. The Constitution in its 8th Schedule gives a list of the Regional languages of

the country and, under Article 345, a State may adopt one of these languages as a language in use. Linguistic States were thereafter formed in respect of the same languages. Is then the present commission, which is appointed in connection with States Reorganisation, going to consider any speech as a "language" and give it the status of an independent language? The question here arises in respect of Konkani. In Karwar it assumes a more serious aspect, but even in Belgaum district, with which alone we are concerned here, Konkani is spoken in Belgaum and Khanapur. The question thus affects in some degree the disputed area in Belgaum district also. If one takes a journey by road from Belgaum to Vengurla, or Goa, or Karwar one scarcely notices where Marathi ends and Konkani begins. The speech of the people of that entire area is one and the same, with only such variations as usually take place every few miles. To call one speech Marathi and another Konkani may be quite right for language scholars—provided they agree, and, in this case, they do not agree—but it is difficult for a lay-man to understand why two people speaking Konkani and Marathi cannot belong to the same State because of a difference in "language". The claim that Konkani is an independent language was first made in Goa, and that for political reasons; and then the controversy started with support on either side from scholars. The census people also since 1931 recognised Konkani as a mother-tongue. Konkani which had no script of its own, and was written in Devanagari or Roman script now began to take a more formal aspect and text books and a grammar also appeared. The politics which goes with Konkani has in recent years produced one more factor

for disintegration of the country. The poison is spreading, and speeches (the Indian word “Bolee” (बोली) is better descriptive of such a speech than the English word “dialect”) of certain other communities too are being claimed to be independent languages. It would be a sorry thing if a Commission for States Reorganisation were to recognise Konkani or any similar speech as “language” and give it the same status as a regional language listed in the 8th schedule. There is no unanimity even amongst scholars, though some of them may be more “renowned” than others. The opinions of scholars and recognition by the census authorities have both no significance here. The question is whether Konkani and Marathi are the same language and fortunately there is no competition by Kannad here. In the opinion of the Samiti for the purposes of the present commission, Konkani speaking persons are to be grouped together with Marathi speaking persons. It would be unrealistic to do otherwise.

10. It appears that another argument is also possible in order to reach the above conclusion. The States Reorganisation Commission in its report has used the expressions “Linguistic homogeneity” and “linguistic affinity”. “Homogeneity” means “of the same kind”, and “affinity” also according to the concise Oxford dictionary suggests family likeness and means “structural resemblance (between languages)”. There is little doubt that Konkani and Marathi are of the same kind and belong to the same family. The structural resemblance also has been pointed out before in reports of Committees and such bodies. It is therefore not clear how the present commission can, on the question of

linguistic States, go beyond the S. R. C. and regard Konkani as a language in its own right and grant it a status which has yet to be conceded by the Constitution.

BELGAUM.

Dated 29th March 1967.

Yours faithfully,

B. R. SUNTHANKAR,
President,
Maharashtra Ekikaran Samiti,
Belgaum.

Government Central Press, Bombay



SUPPLEMENTARY MEMORANDUM
SUBMITTED BY GOVERNMENT OF MAHARASHTRA
TO
THE COMMISSION
ON
MAHARASHTRA - MYSORE - KERALA
BOUNDARY DISPUTES
1967

GOVERNMENT OF MAHARASHTRA

**SUPPLEMENTARY
MEMORANDUM ON MAHARASHTRA-MYSORE
BORDER DISPUTE**

No. MMB-2467/BDC,
GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT,
Sachivalaya, Bombay-32-BR,
22nd May 1967.

From

Shri D. R. PRADHAN,
Chief Secretary to the Government of Maharashtra,
General Administration Department.

To

The SECRETARY,
Commission on Maharashtra-Mysore-Kerala Boundary
Disputes,
Ootacamund.

Subject.—Supplementary Memorandum of the Govern-
ment of Maharashtra on the Maharashtra-
Mysore Border Dispute.

Sir,

In continuation of this Government's Letter No. MMB-2467/
BDC, dated the 31st March, 1967, I have the honour to send
herewith five copies of the Supplementary Memorandum of the
Government of Maharashtra on the Maharashtra-Mysore Border
dispute in respect of the fresh claims made by the Government
of Mysore in their Memorandum to the Commission submitted
on 31st March, 1967.

Yours faithfully,

D. R. PRADHAN,
Chief Secretary to the Government of Maharashtra.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHAPTER I : Introductory 	1
CHAPTER II : Principles of Mysore Government—	
Paragraphs in the Mysore Memorandum answered—	
261-262 	3
256, 257 and 260 	4
CHAPTER III : Sholapur District—	
Paragraphs of Mysore Memorandum—	
263 	7
264-265 	7
266 	8
267 	8
268-269 	9
270 	9
271 	10
272 	11
273 	11
274 	11
275 	12
276-277 	12
278 	12
279 	13
281 	14
282 	14
283 	14
CHAPTER IV : Sholapur Taluka—	
Paragraphs of Mysore Memorandum—	
284 	16
285 	19
286 	20
287 	21
288 	22
289 to 293 	23
294 	24
295 	24
296 	24

	PAGE
CHAPTER V : Sholapur City—	
Paragraphs of Mysore Memorandum—	
297	26
298	26
CHAPTER VI : Akalkot—	
Paragraphs of Mysore Memorandum—	
299	29
300	29
301	29
303	30
304	30
305	31
306	31
307	32
308	32
309	32
311	33
314	33
315	33
316	34
317	34
318	35
320	35
322	35
324	36
CHAPTER VII : Jath Taluka—	
Paragraphs of Mysore Memorandum—	
327	37
328	37
329	37
331	38
333	38
334	38
335	38
337	38
339	39
340-341	39
342	39
343	39
344	40
347	40
348	40
349	41

CONTENTS

iii

	PAGE
CHAPTER VIII : Chandgad Taluka—	
Paragraphs of Mysore Memorandum—	
351-352	42
353	43
354	43
355	43
357	44

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A :	(i) Collector of Kolhapur's letter No. ADM-281, dated 5th September 1944 to the Commissioner, Central Division, Poona regarding splitting up of Sholapur Taluka into two talukas and reconstitution of Sub-divisions.	45
	(ii) Commissioner, Central Division's Endorsement No. A.D.M. 2/77, dated 11th September 1944.	47
	(iii) Government of Bombay, Revenue Department, Resolution No. 4378/39, dated 30th September 1944 regarding splitting up of Sholapur Taluka into two talukas and redistribution of Sub-divisions of Sholapur district.	49
	(iv) Government of Bombay Notification, Revenue Department No. 4378/39, dated 30th September 1944 notifying the distribution of villages between the two talukas.	51
APPENDIX B :	Relevant extracts from the proceedings of the meeting of the Sholapur Municipal Corporation held on 4th May 1967.	53
APPENDIX C :	Statement showing the villages from Akalkot Taluka proposed to be retained with the Maharashtra State.	55

INTRODUCTORY

On 31st March 1967, the Government of Maharashtra submitted its Memorandum on Maharashtra-Mysore Border Dispute to the Commission on Maharashtra-Mysore-Kerala Boundary Disputes. That Memorandum dealt, in the light of the fundamental basis of the reorganisation of the States in India, with the proposals made by the former Government of Bombay in 1957 for readjusting the boundary between the States of Bombay and Mysore. The Government of Bombay had then suggested that, as in the case of Belgaum and Karwar areas, the demarcation of the boundary between the Bombay and Mysore States in the Akkalkot, South Sholapur and Mangalwedha talukas of Sholapur district, in Jath taluka of the then South Satara (now Sangli) district and in Shirol and Gadhinglaj talukas of Kolhapur district should be reviewed and the boundaries adjusted so as to transfer to the Mysore State contiguous Kannad-speaking areas. According to those proposals, 260 villages in these talukas were to be transferred to the Mysore State. In paragraph 6.157 of their Memorandum submitted to the Commission on Maharashtra-Mysore-Kerala Boundary Disputes on 31st March 1967, the Government of Maharashtra have stated that they would have no objection to the boundary being readjusted in these areas on the principles suggested by them in that Memorandum provided those principles were equally applied in readjusting the boundary in the areas claimed by the Government of Maharashtra.

1.2. During the ten years in which the dispute has been pending, the Government of Mysore made no specific proposals in regard to the Kannad-majority areas included in the then Bombay State by the States Reorganisation Act of 1956. Perhaps, their proposal to make 'minor adjustments' within a 10-mile belt in the districts of the former Bombay State on either side of the present boundaries could be said to have covered the question of the Kannad-majority areas on the border of the

then Bombay State. However, in their memorandum submitted to the One-Man Commission the Government of Mysore, for the first time not only claimed the areas offered by the then Bombay Government but also laid further claims to some more areas in Maharashtra.

1.3. The question whether these claims were within the purview of the Commission was raised by the Commission itself and referred by it to the Government of India. The latter left it to the Commission to decide whether or not to consider these claims. On the 8th May 1967, the Commission asked the representatives of this Government to forward to it this Government's comments on the Mysore Government's claims by the 23rd May 1967. This Supplementary Memorandum has accordingly been prepared. It deals with the observations made in paragraphs 256 to 359 at pages 77 to 110 of the Mysore Government's Memorandum.

* * *

II

PRINCIPLES OF MYSORE GOVERNMENT

In the Memorandum submitted to the Commission by the Government of Mysore, there are eight chapters pertaining to "Mysore's claims to areas in Maharashtra". In paragraphs 261 and 262 of that Memorandum, the Government of Mysore have stated as follows :—

" 261. We should note here that according to the Government of Maharashtra, there are within their State, 260 villages which are admittedly Kannada. This clear averment further implies that they are prepared to have them transferred to the State of Mysore. As this is a matter of admission, the Government of Mysore need not dilate or discuss anything about the merits of these areas, but they do claim them and are prepared and willing to take all such areas which are offered by Maharashtra.

" 262. According to the Government of Mysore, there are many more areas in Maharashtra State which deserve to be transferred to Mysore".

2.2. These areas according to that Government's Memorandum, are as follows :—

(1) The North Sholapur taluka and that part of South Sholapur taluka which the Government of Bombay proposed to retain ; in other words, the whole of the former Sholapur taluka consisting of 152 villages as it existed before it was bifurcated into the talukas of North Sholapur and South Sholapur.

(2) Sholapur City.

(3) That part of Akkalkot taluka which the Government of Bombay proposed to retain ; in other words the whole of Akkalkot taluka.

(4) That part of Jath taluka which the Government of Bombay proposed to retain ; in other words the whole of Jath taluka.

(5) The whole of Chandgad taluka.

2.3. The 260 villages having relative majority of Kannad-speaking population according to the Census of 1951 which the Government of Bombay had offered to transfer to the State of Mysore formed part of different talukas of different districts as follows :—

District.	Taluka.	No. of villages.
Sholapur	South Sholapur	... 65
"	Mangalwedha	... 9
"	Akkalkot	... 99
South Satara (now Sangli)	Jath	... 44
Kolhapur	Shirol	... 19
"	Gadhinglaj	... 24
Total ...		260

It will be seen from this that in the Mangalwedha Taluka of Sholapur District and in the Shirol and Gadhinglaj Talukas of Kolhapur District, the Government of Mysore have no additional claims to make and that the additional claims pertain to the whole of North Sholapur Taluka including the Sholapur City, the remaining 15 villages of South Sholapur Taluka, the remaining 25 villages of Akkalkot Taluka, the remaining 54 villages of Jath Taluka and the whole of Chandgad Taluka.

2.4. The Government of Mysore have made these additional claims on the basis of certain principles *vide* paragraphs 256, 257 and 260 of their Memorandum. They are as follows :—

(1) Linguistic homogeneity has to play a subordinate and a very minor role in the distribution of territories. Linguistic considerations are to be looked upon as a point leading to administrative convenience.

(2) Primary importance has always to be given to the administrative convenience, economic considerations, cultural ties and to the benefit of the people.

(3) District is the appropriate unit, but taluka has to be taken as the unit under special circumstances.

(4) A departure from these general principles is to be allowed only in respect of areas where the parties concerned agree to the same.

2.5. The Government of Mysore have observed in paragraph 260 of their Memorandum that they have been guided by the principles mentioned above which were adopted by the States Reorganisation Commission. It is not correct to say that the States Reorganisation Commission regarded linguistic homogeneity as a subordinate and very minor factor in the redistribution of territories. They have, in fact, mentioned that a balanced approach was necessary to the problem of creating linguistic States. The balanced approach of their conception recognised linguistic homogeneity as an important factor conducive to administrative convenience and efficiency but did not consider it as an exclusive and binding principle overriding all other considerations, administrative, financial and political. This cannot be paraphrased to mean that linguistic homogeneity has played "a subordinate and a very minor role" in the proposals for reorganisation of States made by the States Reorganisation Commission.

2.6. The principles enunciated by the States Reorganisation Commission which have been referred to by the Government of Mysore were evolved for the purpose of carving out new States out of the then existing States, mainly on the basis of language although they were not called linguistic States. The problem before the present Commission is not of creation of new States as in the case of Punjab and Haryana but of adjusting the boundaries of two linguistic States in order to secure linguistic homogeneity to the farthest possible extent. In that view of the matter, as has already been stated in paragraphs 2.27 to 2.30 of this Government's Memorandum submitted to the Commission on

31st March 1967, the principles adopted by the States Reorganisation Commission are not wholly relevant. The extent to which they are relevant has been mentioned in the aforesaid paragraphs of that Memorandum. It is not, therefore, necessary at this stage to discuss the merits or the suitability of the principles mentioned by the Government of Mysore.

* * *

III

SHOLAPUR DISTRICT

In paragraphs 263.283 of their Memorandum, the Government of Mysore have dealt with "Sholapur District" and "Areas of Sholapur District". In these two chapters that Government have made certain observations which pertain to all the areas of Sholapur District claimed by them. It is proposed to consider here the said observations.

3.2. In paragraph 263 of the aforesaid Memorandum, that Government have said that formerly "Sholapur was called as Sonnalige or Sonnalapur names, which we often find used in Kannad literary works. The former of these two names is associated with the great Saint known as Sonnalige Siddharameshwar." The implication of this observation is probably that Sholapur City takes its name from the Saint Sonnalige Siddharameshwar who was a Kannad Saint, and that, therefore, it should be included in Mysore State. The implication is not correct, as can be seen from the history of Sholapur City given in the Gazetteer of Sholapur District published in 1884. Foot-Note No. 5 at page 485 of the Gazetteer states that the word "Sholapur" means 16 villages : "From *Sola* sixteen and *pur* villages. The 16 villages on whose site Sholapur was built are Adilpur, Ahmadpur, Chamladev, Fattehpur, Jamdarvadi, Kajlapur, Khaderpur, Khandravkivadi, Muhammadpur, Ranapur, Sandalpur, Shaikpur, Sholapur, Sonalgi, Sonapur and Vaidkivadi". No further comment seems needed.

3.3. In paragraphs 264 and 265, the Government of Mysore have given two quotations from the District Gazetteer of Sholapur, which mention that Sholapur was a part of what was then called Bombay Karnatak. A close reading of the Gazetteers will show that the terms such as "Bombay Karnatak" and "Southern Maratha Country" have been used somewhat loosely. In some places, the area consisting of the present Belgaum District has

been described as Southern Maratha Country. It is not the case of the Government of Maharashtra that all such area should be transferred to Maharashtra because it was called Southern Maratha Country.

3.4. In paragraph 266 of their Memorandum the Mysore Government have quoted from H. R. Bhatnagar's 'Life of Munro' to show that Marathi speaking people in Bijapur, Sholapur, Belgaum and Dharwar were, in the times of General Munro, strangers to that part of the country and that the predominant language there was Kanarese. As the Government of Maharashtra admit that there are Kannad-speaking areas in their State and are willing to transfer them to the State of Mysore this point does not survive.

3.5. In paragraph 267 of their Memorandum, the Mysore Government have quoted Dr. Khare, Director of Bharat Itihas Sanshodhak Mandal, Poona. The Government of Maharashtra have made enquiries with Dr. Khare in the matter and he has given the following statement :—

“ In paragraph 267 of the Mysore Government Memorandum to the Boundary Dispute Commission, there is a quotation of a statement said to have been made by Prof. G. S. Khare, Curator and Secretary of the Bharat Itihas Sanshodhak Mandal. The last sentence of the so-called quotation runs as follows :—

“ All this territory (Sholapur District) was Kannad at that time (17th Century).

But let me clarify my position. I have never said in any of my writings that the territory in question was Kannad at any time. What I have said is that whatever may be the language (Marathi, Telgu, Kannad, etc.) spoken by the people inhabiting this territory, they had of their own accord adopted Marathi language and Modi script for all their writings, whether private, public or Government, during the Muslim rule of the 16th and 17th Centuries”.

The original statement will be produced before the Commission, if required. In support of this, the original book from which

this extract is supposed to have been taken will also be produced before the Commission if required. The name of the book is "Records of the Shivaji Period", Vol. XI, pages 53 to 56.

3.6. In paragraphs 268 and 269, the Government of Mysore have given quotations from the Sholapur District Gazetteer to show that the areas under consideration had administrative connections with the Kannad areas of Bijapur District. It will be seen from page 303 of the Gazetteer that before 1869 when the district of Sholapur was formed, its sub-divisions were frequently transferred from one district to another. Of the 7 sub-divisions included in the district in 1884, Pandharpur and Sangola were in Satara until 1864 and Malsiras until 1875. Before 1838, the northern sub-division of Karmala was in Ahmednagar and the central sub-division of Mohol was in Poona and the eastern and southern sub-divisions of Barsi and Sholapur more than once passed from Ahmednagar to Poona and from Poona to Ahmednagar. In 1838, the sub-divisions of Sholapur, Barsi, Mohol, Madha, Karmala, Indi, Hippargi and Muddebihal formed a collectorate styled Sholapur which was abolished in 1864. In 1869, the sub-divisions of Sholapur, Barsi, Mohol, Madha and Karmala together with Pandharpur and Sangola were formed into the district which in 1875 received from Satara the addition of Malsiras. Foot-Note No. 3 at pages 303-304 gives the details of the various changes which occurred in the administrative set-up from 1819 to 1884. They clearly show that from the point of view of administrative connections, Sholapur had greater affinity with the districts of Poona and Ahmednagar than with the district of Bijapur.

3.7. In paragraph 270 of their Memorandum, the Government of Mysore have stated that Sholapur Taluka has recently been divided into two, viz., Sholapur North and Sholapur South, both having their headquarters in Sholapur City. This statement is factually incorrect. The division of Sholapur Taluka into Sholapur North and Sholapur South took place in 1944 i.e., 23 years ago and not recently.

3.8. It has further been stated in paragraph 270 that both the talukas, viz., Sholapur Taluka as it existed prior to its division

and Akkalkot Taluka are mainly Kannad-speaking. This statement is also factually incorrect. The former Sholapur taluka which constituted of the present North Sholapur and South Sholapur Talukas had only 20.01 per cent. Kannad-speaking population according to the Census of 1951. A considerable part of the Akkalkot Taluka is predominantly Kannad-speaking and it is for this reason that the then Government of Bombay had proposed to transfer 99 out of 124 villages of Akkalkot Taluka to the Mysore State.

3.9. The Government of Mysore have further stated in the same paragraph that in their Memorandum presented in 1957 even the Government of Maharashtra had practically conceded that most part of this area may be transferred except for the City of Sholapur and for the town of Akkalkot and a few villages near about. The Memorandum of 1957 was presented by the Government of the then bilingual State of Bombay and not by the Government of Maharashtra. In that Memorandum, as pointed out above, a majority of the villages in South Sholapur and Akkalkot Talukas were offered for transfer to the Mysore State on the basis of the 1951 Census. It was not conceded then, as alleged by the Mysore Government, that any part of the North Sholapur Taluka was Kannad in character. Similarly, the City of Sholapur and the town of Akkalkot had, according to the Census of 1961, relative majority of Marathi speaking population and therefore there was no question of proposing their transfer to the Mysore State, in the light of the principles for readjustment of boundaries proposed by the Government of Bombay.

3.10. The purport of paragraph 271 of the Mysore Government's Memorandum appears to be that because Saint Siddhameshwara who hailed from Sonnalige or Sholapur, was a Kannad Saint and because for the benefit of the local people, he built a big lake which is still known by the name of Siddeshwara or Siddarameshwara Tank, Sholapur City of today should be transferred to the Mysore State. As already explained, our purpose here is to secure the maximum convenience of the present population in these areas. Religious or historical connections of ancient times have, therefore, little or no relevance. Further it is a common

occurrence in this country for saints born in one part of the country to have followers in other parts of the country.

3.11. In paragraph 272 of the said Memorandum, the Mysore Government have referred to the cult of Basava. It is stated that "it is but natural that places like Akkalkot and Sholapur must have come within the sphere of these activities. The areas where the present talukas of Akkalkot, Sholapur or Omerga are located were not only full of Lingayats but they abounded in Kannad writers as well. Since those times, if not earlier, they have been pure Kannad-speaking areas". It has already been pointed out that the areas which are actually Kannad-speaking have already been offered by the Government of Maharashtra for transfer to the Mysore State. It would be wrong to describe any other areas as "pure" Kannad-speaking areas.

3.12. In paragraph 273 of the same Memorandum, reference has been made to several Kannad inscriptions said to have been found at the villages of Kumbhari, Limbi Chincholi, Mandrup and Aurad. All these villages are among those proposed to be transferred to Mysore and therefore admittedly Kannad places. There is no need, therefore, to stress their Kannad character.

3.13. Mention has also been made in the said paragraph 273 of reference to the temples etc. in Sholapur in old inscriptions found in certain far off places in the heart of Karnataka. Reference has been made to inscriptions of 1264 and 1256 A.D. As already observed, historical connections have no relevance for our present purpose. Further, Marathi inscriptions are also to be found in Kannad areas.

3.14. It is stated in paragraph 274 of the Mysore Government Memorandum that because Kannada formed a small minority in the district during the British regime, it came to be ignored that consequently "these circumstances not only diminished the normal currency of Kannad but stunted its growth almost completely in Sholapur and its neighbourhood. What is really surprising is that though stifled in this manner Kannada language still persists and has held up its head in the said areas." The reference obviously is to the British time and there is no reason to suppose that the British had any particular bias for

Marathi at the expense of Kannada. To them both the languages were same and if Kannada languished, the reasons must be other than those alleged. Further what is to be considered by the Commission is the relative prevalence of these languages at present times and not the reasons which led to the present state of affairs.

3.15. In paragraph 275 of the Memorandum of the Government of Mysore it has been stated that, although the Talukas of Akkalkot and South Sholapur were eligible to be treated as bilingual under the circular issued by the Government of Bombay on the 15th October 1949, no action in that respect has been taken till now. It is true that there has been delay in this matter which the Government of Maharashtra regrets. But the delay can be easily explained. The question of reorganisation of States on the basis of language has been under consideration since 1953 when the States Reorganisation Commission was appointed. It was expected that this Commission would transfer these areas to the Kannad-speaking State to be formed after the reorganisation. But this did not happen. Immediately after the reorganisation of States in 1956, the then Government of Bombay offered these areas to the State of Mysore and the matter has been pending since then first with the Zonal Council, then before the Four-Man Committee and finally with the Government of India. It was expected during all these years that these areas would be transferred to the State of Mysore any time and the necessity to declare them bilingual would not survive. If, in these circumstances, delay has occurred, it would only be natural and no sinister motive, as alleged by Mysore Government, can be attributed to it.

3.16. Paragraphs 276 and 277 of the said Memorandum contain comments on the States Reorganisation Commission's report. It is not necessary for this Government to offer any remarks thereon.

3.17. In paragraph 278 of the said Memorandum, mention has been made of public holidays observed in Sholapur, Akkalkot and the other areas in question on the occasion of Basava Jayanti and "Karahunive". Similarly, it has been mentioned

that the portrait of Basava is hung in the Office of the Municipality of Sholapur. These facts show that although these linguistically different areas have been in Maharashtra, due consideration has been given to the sentiments of the linguistic minority. This does not, however, mean that the whole area is Kannad in character. Wherever the Kannad character of the population is established by the Census figures, it has been proposed to transfer the areas to the Mysore State.

3.18. In regard to the allegations made in paragraph 279 of the said Memorandum to the effect that Kannad people and Kannad language have been suffering under the domination of the Marathi people, that their legitimate grievances go unheeded and that the elementary right of Kannadigas to have their children educated in their mother tongue is denied, it would be worthwhile to refer to the Sholapur District Gazetteer which says about Lingayats "Most speak Marathi both at home and abroad and some speak Kanarese at home" (page 75). "Lingayat Vanis send their children to school but do not keep them at school for any length of time. The boys learn to read and write Marathi and to cast accounts and the girls learn to read Marathi and Kanarese at home" (page 85). It is also stated with regard to Jangams or Lingayat priests that "their home tongue is Marathi" (page 184). This will indicate that the Lingayats as a class have taken to Marathi and given up Kannad and this is the position since before 1884. Naturally there is no demand for Kannada schools. Even then the fact that there has been no denial of the elementary right of the Kannadigas to educate their children in Kannad can be seen from the following figures :—

	No. of primary Marathi schools	No. of pupils	No. of pupils per school	No. of primary Kannad schools	No. of pupils	No. of pupils per school
Sholapur City ..	136	43,468	319·6	15	1,976	131·7
Akkalkot Taluka.	121	17,214	142·6	82	8,919	108·7
South Sholapur Taluka.	89	15,962	179·3	12	1,297	108·1

It will be seen from this that better facilities have been provided for education of Kannad-speaking pupils than for the education of Marathi-speaking pupils.

3.19. The question about the facilities to be given to the language minorities in the areas concerned has already been dealt with in paragraph 3.15 above. It may, however, be mentioned that as far as Court languages are concerned, that is a matter falling within the jurisdiction of the High Court.

3.20. It is contended in paragraph 281 of the said Memorandum that the cotton mills in Sholapur have to depend upon the cotton grown in the districts of Bijapur, Belgaum, Dharwar, Raichur and Gulbarga for the supply of cotton and that therefore the industry has much better prospects of growth and development in Sholapur if that area is again joined to the Mysore State. In the first instance, Sholapur was never a part of the Mysore State and there is therefore no question of "again" joining it to that State. Secondly, cotton is an essential commodity, and its production, supply and distribution have been under the full control of the Central Government since the Second World War. The needs of the cotton industry and the places from which cotton should be supplied to any particular mill are matters within the control of the Central Government authorities. It is not correct to say that the Sholapur cotton industry will prosper only if Sholapur is included in the Mysore State.

3.21. In paragraph 282 of the said Memorandum, it has been contended that for its foodgrains and milk supply also Sholapur City has to depend on the Kannad areas "to the Southern and Eastern and to some extent of the North-Eastern parts". The Maharashtra Government consider that this is no reason for transfer of Sholapur City to the Mysore State.

3.22. In paragraph 283 of their Memorandum the Government of Mysore have observed that in matters of trade not only Sholapur but a large portion of that District has dealings with Karnatak since before a century and a special mention has been

made about the trade in 1840, of Vairag, a town in the Barsi Taluka. For one thing, the trade position of 100 years ago is not relevant to the present dispute ; for another, it is obvious that normal trade connections are not affected by reorganisation of States or their boundaries.

* * *

IV

SHOLAPUR TALUKA

Paragraphs 284 to 296 of the Mysore Government's Memorandum deal with the former Sholapur Taluka, i.e. the area covered by the present North Sholapur and South Sholapur Talukas.

4.2. In paragraph 284 the Government of Mysore have observed :—

“ About 20 years before, when the question of linguistic provinces was being seriously considered, the Taluka of Sholapur was divided into two unequal parts. North Sholapur consists of 44 villages and South Sholapur consists of 80 villages. The Head-quarters for both is the City of Sholapur itself ”.

It is further observed—

“ It is obvious that the division has been so effected as to include all the Kannad-speaking areas into South Sholapur Taluka and consequently the Marathi-speaking villages together with the city of Sholapur into the North Sholapur Taluka. It is alleged that this was deliberately done so that when the linguistic States would be formed, it should be easy to allocate the South Sholapur Taluka to Karnataka and to retain Sholapur City as a part of the Marathi portion, viz. the North Sholapur Taluka. If there was no such partition and if the Taluka was one, the City of Sholapur would easily be included with the Kannad-speaking area and it was this likelihood that the designers of the division wanted to forestall. It is needless to say that this design was the work of Ministers in the Bombay State, who were more interested in Marathi ”.

4.3. It is first necessary to correct some factual errors in the Mysore Government's above statements. The division of the former Sholapur Taluka took place in the times of the British in the year 1944 and not after 1947 as implied by the Mysore

Government. In the year 1944 the question of creation of linguistic provinces was not even thought of and even the question of Indian independence was far from settled. The former Sholapur Taluka consisted of 152 villages including Sholapur City and not 123 villagers as stated by the Mysore Government. 52 villages and Sholapur City were included in the North Sholapur Taluka and 99 villages were included in the South Sholapur Taluka.

4.4. It has been alleged by the Mysore Government that if there was no such partition and if the Taluka was one, the City of Sholapur would easily be included with the Kannad-speaking area and it was this likelihood that the designers of the division wanted to forestall. According to the census of 1951, which was the census taken into account by the States Reorganisation Commission in determining the areas of each new linguistic State, the position of North and South Sholapur Talukas was as follows :—

			Total	Marathi	Kannad
North Sholapur	3,24,874	1,45,419	38,764
South Sholapur	93,484	30,147	44,967
			4,18,358	1,75,566	83,731
				41.9%	20.01%

It will be seen from this that even if the former Sholapur Taluka had not been bifurcated, the Kannad population was too small (20.01 per cent.) for its inclusion in the State of Mysore. The States Reorganisation Commission had decided not to break up a district unless the percentage of any particular linguistic group in a taluka was 70 per cent. or more. In view of the fact that Kannad-speaking people accounted for only 20 per cent. of the population of the former Sholapur Taluka, it is not clear how the Mysore Government say that if there was no partition of the Taluka, the City of Sholapur would have been included in the Mysore State as a part of Kannad area by the States Reorganisation Commission.

4.5. The Mysore Government have also referred to an allegation (the authors of which are not mentioned) that the division

of the Sholapur Taluka was deliberately done, so that when the linguistic States would be formed, it should be easy to allocate the South Sholapur Taluka to Karnatak and to retain Sholapur City as a part of the Marathi portion, viz., North Sholapur Taluka. That Government has, however, itself alleged that this design was the work of Ministers in the Bombay State who were more interested in Marathi. It has already been pointed out above that Sholapur Taluka was divided in 1944 when India was still under British rule. There was no popular Ministry then in the Province of Bombay. There was an Advisers' regime. As there were no Ministers then, the allegation that the division was the design of the Ministers, who were more interested in Marathi, is totally baseless. As for the other allegation that the division was deliberately done so that when the linguistic States would be formed, it should be easy to allocate South Sholapur Taluka to Karnatak and to retain Sholapur City in Maharashtra, it has already been pointed out that the question of the formation of linguistic States was totally beyond the horizon in 1944. The proposal to divide the taluka was mooted by the then Collector of Sholapur, supported by the then Commissioner, Central Division and approved by Adviser (Revenue) and Adviser (Finance), all of whom were Englishmen who were members of the Indian Civil Service. Copies of (i) the Collector's Letter No. ADM-281, dated 5th September 1944 (without accompaniments), (ii) Commissioner's Endorsement No. ADM-2/77, dated 11th September 1944, (iii) Government Resolution, Revenue Department, No. 4378/39, dated 30th September 1944 and (iv) Government Notification No. 4378/39, dated 30th September 1944 are given in Appendix "A". It will be seen from these documents that the only reason which prompted the division of Sholapur Taluka was that it was too large for efficient administration by one Mamlatdar, the more so in view of its land development, supply and other problems. The Adviser (Finance) observed in this connection as follows :-

“Certainly the new taluka containing Sholapur City must be far less in extent than the other new Taluka and also the belt running along the southern border of the Taluka from

east to west is very largely homogeneous, Lingayat, troublesome and fertile and differs considerably from the north of the Taluka ”.

Thus although the South Sholapur Taluka was considered to be very largely Lingayat and troublesome, it was in nobody's mind then that it should be carved with the purpose of including it in a Kannad-speaking State.

4.6. In the same paragraph 284 of the Mysore Government Memorandum it is also stated that the area covered by the South Sholapur Taluka is almost completely Kannada and touches the very fringe of the city and that this corroborates the fact that Sholapur was formerly a Kannada City. How the conclusion follows from the statement is not clear. The admission that Sholapur was 'formerly' a Kannada City implies that it is not now a Kannada City and that it should be transferred to Mysore because it was formerly Kannada. As pointed out earlier, ancient history is not relevant in solving the present question.

4.7. In paragraph 285 of their Memorandum the Government of Mysore State that to the North of Sholapur City, there were only about 30 villages which were Marathi-speaking and which could be included in the North Sholapur Taluka and that in order to make up the shortage some more villages from beyond the old Sholapur Taluka, were added to make 44 villages, in North Sholapur Taluka. In the same way about 27 villages, from the remaining part of the Sholapur Taluka were transferred to Mohol Taluka of the same district leaving 80 villages to form the South Sholapur Taluka. It will be seen from the Notification No. 4378/39, dated the 30th September 1944, reproduced in Appendix "A", that the old Sholapur Taluka consisted of 152 villages including Sholapur City, of which 53 including Sholapur City were constituted in North Sholapur Taluka, and 99 in South Sholapur Taluka. Thus no villages from beyond the old Sholapur Taluka were added to make up the North Sholapur Taluka, and no villages were transferred to reduce the size of the South Sholapur Taluka.

4.8. It has further been stated in the same paragraph that although Kannad-speaking population of South Sholapur Taluka

is 48.1 per cent. and Marathi-speaking population is 32.2 per cent., and although most of the remaining 19.4 per cent., Urdu-speaking population and the Marathi-speaking population know Kannada as well, the Maharashtra Government proposed to transfer only 65 villages as Kannada-speaking and to retain 15 villages on the ground that they have Marathi majority. It is contended by them that 8 villages form pockets inside the Kannada-speaking villages, and that on their own showing the Maharashtra Government cannot claim anything more than 12 villages. In the opinion of the Mysore Government the Maharashtra Government are not entitled to claim even these 12 villages as that would mean splitting up of the taluka. The Government of Maharashtra had made it amply clear that the fresh line of demarcation suggested by them was based on the village as unit, and relative majority as between Kannada and Marathi in each village according to the 1951 Census. Consequently, the percentage of the Kannada-speaking and the Marathi-speaking populations in the whole taluka of South Sholapur was not relevant for determining the number of villages to be transferred to Mysore. The Maharashtra Government have not proposed to retain 8 Marathi majority villages which form pockets within the Kannad majority villages. Besides those 8 villages, there are 15 villages in South Sholapur Taluka which had a relative majority of Marathi-speaking population and which were contiguous to the Marathi majority area of the State, and therefore it was proposed to retain them in Maharashtra.

4.9. In the same paragraph 285, the Mysore Government have stated that the Government of Maharashtra are not entitled to claim 12 villages in the South Sholapur Taluka as that would mean splitting up of the Taluka. In the next paragraph 286 also they have stated that there should be no breaking up of a Taluka under any circumstances. In view of these statements it is not clear how the Government of Mysore are claiming the 9 villages in Mangalwedha Taluka, 19 villages in Shirol Taluka and 24 villages in Gadhinglaj Taluka which were offered by the Government of Maharashtra. In paragraph 261 of their

Memorandum the Government of Mysore have stated that they claim all the 260 villages offered for transfer to Mysore State by the Government of Maharashtra. This is inconsistent with the principle of not splitting up a Taluka as mentioned by them in paragraphs 285 and 286.

4.10. In paragraph 287 of their Memorandum, the Mysore Government have referred to the book entitled "History of Sholapur City" by Rao Saheb V. N. Jakkal and a quotation from the book has been given in the foot-note in which according to the Mysore Government it is stated that till very recently 85 per cent. of the Sholapur population was speaking Kannad language and also till recent years even accounts were kept in Kannad by the merchants of Sholapur. The foot-note gives details about Rao Saheb Jakkal probably to show that he being a Telugu person, his statement regarding the population and accounts of the merchants of Sholapur should be accepted as impartial. In the first place, the quotation given is from Part VII of the book where it is clearly mentioned at the outset that the information given in that part was obtained from Shri Mallikarjunappa Apparao Patil. It is clear, therefore, that the correctness of the information quoted is not vouched for by Shri Jakkal. Secondly, the quotation in Marathi does not use any words meaning "till very recently" or "till recent years". On the other hand, it says that the merchants used to maintain their accounts in Kannada *till 1825-30* and the reference to the percentage of people speaking Kannad as also to the dominance of Lingayats in trade pertains to the same period. Thirdly, the year in which the book was published is not given in the book, but enquiries made by the Government of Maharashtra reveal that it was published in or about 1926. It is stated in the Foreword to the book by the Author that he had written the book about 15-16 years earlier and that 60 pages of it had even been printed, but that due to some circumstances, printing could not be completed. All this means that the information given in the book pertains to the period around 1910. Even if, therefore, it is assumed that the statements quoted in the Mysore Government's Memorandum are factually correct, they pertain to a period

more than 50 if not 100 years ago, and, therefore, it would not be correct to base any conclusion about the present character of Sholapur City on that information. Besides the Gazetteer of 1884 contradicts the statements made in this book.

4.11. In the latter part of paragraph 287 of the Memorandum, the Government of Mysore have observed that apart from the outside population coming in with the growth of trade, there has been influence of Marathi as the official language and of Marathi people as officials at the District Headquarters, that there was a super-imposition of the Marathi language on the substrata of Kannada whose sphere of activity has receded to the realms of domestic talk. Apart from other things, this is a clear admission that at present Kannad is neither the dominant language nor the dominant culture of Sholapur City and therefore the Mysore Government claim for inclusion of that City in the Mysore State cannot stand. The question whether the substrata is of Kannad speaking population or of some other language group is not important for our present purpose. The population figures available from 1881 show that the Marathi-speaking population has always been predominant in Sholapur City. In 1881, out of 1,49,539 people, 1,25,538 or 83.9 per cent. were Hindus whereas 9,906 were Lingayat-Vanis. In 1901 out of 75,288 people, 55,988 were Hindus and out of 8,006 educated persons, 6,665 were Marathi and 184 Kannad. In the 1931 Census, the Lingayats numbered 12,000 in a population of 1,35,574 (pages 47-48 of Sholapur Municipality Centenary Volume). According to the 1951 Census, the population of the City was 2,76,510 of whom 1,07,253 (38.8 per cent.) were Marathi-speaking and 35,643 (12.9 per cent.) were Kannad-speaking. It is not, therefore, clear how the Mysore Government says that on the substrata of the Kannad-speaking people Marathi was super-imposed.

4.12. In paragraph 288 of their Memorandum, the Government of Mysore have alleged that as there are only Marathi schools, Kannad people had perforce to learn reading and writing in Marathi, with the result that most of the people speak

Kannad at home and in personal talk but use Marathi for most of the formal transactions. Because of this, in the view of the Mysore Government in the later enumerations of the census, such people have come to be reckoned as Marathi-speaking and this accounts for the increase in language percentage of Marathi and decrease in the Kannad percentage. These allegations are not supported by facts. In Sholapur City for 43,468 Marathi-speaking students, there are 136 primary schools whereas for 1976 Kannad-speaking students, there are 15 primary schools. This means that there is one primary school for about 320 Marathi-speaking students whereas there is one primary school for 132 Kannad-speaking students. In this state of affairs, to say that the Kannad people have perforce to learn reading and writing Marathi is contrary to facts. It is also stated that in "later" enumerations of the Census, Kannad-speaking people have come to be reckoned as Marathi-speaking. From the population figures at different Censuses mentioned in the preceding paragraph it will be seen that the Marathi-speaking people have consistently been in substantial majority from as far back as 1881, language-wise break-up of population since when was readily available. It is not, therefore, true that originally there was a large number of Kannad-speaking people and that through wrong enumeration in later Censuses Kannad-speaking people were enumerated as Marathi-speaking people resulting in a higher percentage of Marathi-speaking people and lower of Kannad-speaking people.

4.13. In paragraphs 289 to 293 of the Mysore Government's Memorandum reference has been made to the religious and cultural links of Sholapur City with Kannad. Reliance has been placed for this purpose on the book "History of Sholapur City" by Rao Saheb V. N. Jakkal. A perusal of pages 41 to 46 and 46 to 48 of that book will show that there are a number of temples of Hindus (as opposed to Lingayats) and a number of masjids also. It cannot, therefore, be said that Sholapur City has any predominantly Kannad character. In fact it cannot have such character because of the small percentage of Kannad-speaking people in the City throughout the recorded period. Consequently

historical and religious connections of Sholapur with Kannad area cannot become a reason for transferring the city to the Mysore State.

4.14. In paragraph 294 of the Memorandum, reference has been made to the temple of Maruti. It is contended that it was formerly known as "Modala Maruti Temple", but that due to the impact of Marathi it is now known as "Madhala Maruti". Even supposing the contention of Mysore Government to be true, the point is too trifling to make out any case for transferring Sholapur City to Mysore State.

4.15. The same is the case with the incident mentioned in paragraph 295 of the Memorandum regarding the sacrifice of a Lingayat Wani woman at the foot of the tower of the fort of Sholapur. Such instances will at the most establish nothing more than the presence of some Kannadigas in Sholapur City in former times.

4.16. Paragraph 296 of the Memorandum deals with Kannad literature and trade. It has been said that the seat of Saint Basava's activities was Kalyan. Sholapur and Akkalkot Talukas being within a radius of about 50 to 60 miles from Kalyan, the influence of Kannad was very strong in these areas. Saint Basava flourished in the 12th century and it is of academic importance now to determine the extent of the influence of Kannad in these areas in those days. What we are concerned with is the linguistic composition of the present population of the area, and it cannot be said that the City can today form a homogeneous part of a Kannad tract. According to the 1961 Census, the Kannad-speaking population of Sholapur City is only 12.77 per cent. whereas the Marathi-speaking population is 39.08 per cent., Telugu 25.05 per cent. and Urdu 17.33 per cent. Speakers of Kannad, therefore, form the fourth largest group in the City. There is, therefore, no case whatever for the transfer of Sholapur City to Mysore on the grounds mentioned by the Government of Mysore.

4.17. The Karnatak Ekikaran Maha Samiti never contested any elections during the past 10 years on the issue of transfer of South Sholapur Taluka, Sholapur City or any other area to Mysore or on any other issue. On the other hand, the Taluka Panchayat Samiti of South Sholapur Taluka has passed a resolution on 12th April 1967 unanimously for retention of the taluka in Maharashtra. Besides, a number of Village Panchayats have also passed resolutions and forwarded them to the Commission informing the Commission that the development of their villages will be facilitated by retaining them in Maharashtra and urging the Commission not to transfer them to the Mysore State. It is thus clear that the people of the area do not desire to be transferred to the Mysore State.

* * *

SHOLAPUR CITY

In paragraphs 297 and 298 of the Mysore Government's Memorandum, some more arguments have been advanced to show the Kannad character of the City of Sholapur. In paragraph 297 it has been stated that the City of Sholapur is a cosmopolitan one and that in spite of its being linked up with a large portion of Marathi area and the official influence of Marathi, Marathi has not made serious inroads on the linguistic complexion of the city. In support of this argument, it has been stated that while the percentage of Marathi-speaking people is 38.8 according to the 1951 Census and that of Kannad-speaking about 13, the remaining 48 per cent of the population, which consists mostly of Telugu-speaking and Urdu-speaking people, is conversant with Kannad and is in favour of transfer to Mysore State. On this basis, it has been said that the linguistic gravity of the town is more in favour of Karnatak. No evidence has been brought forward to support the contention that the Telugu-speaking and Urdu-speaking people are in favour of transfer of Sholapur City to Mysore State. It has been said in the same paragraph that since centuries Sholapur has been a completely Kannad area and that its present growth and development is of a comparatively recent date. However, the figures of different Censuses given by the Mysore Government in this paragraph do not show that there was a preponderance of Kannad-speaking people at any period of time. On the contrary, the figures given in paragraph 4-11 above show that there has been a preponderance of Marathi-speaking people since 1881, if not earlier.

5.2. In paragraph 298 of the Memorandum, it is stated that in the Sholapur City Municipality there have all along been several Kannad representatives ever since its inception in 1852, and even in the very first Committee nominated by the Government there were Kannad representatives. Many of the Presi-

dents of the Municipality since then are said to have been Kannad people. Even in the present Municipal Corporation of Sholapur, out of 59 members who are elected, 27 are stated to be Kannad-speaking and 12 Marathi-speaking and the remaining 20 are said to be speaking other languages. It may be pointed out that out of the 9 members nominated by Government in 1852 to the first Committee, only one Shri Dharmarao Thobade was a Lingayat and he used to read and write Marathi and sign in Marathi only. There have been 40 Presidents of the Sholapur Municipality during its life of 115 years. Out of these 40, only 9 were Lingayats and the total period of their regime was 12 years. Among the 59 existing Corporators of the Sholapur Municipal Corporation, only 8 are Lingayats. Most of the remaining are those whose mother-tongue is Marathi or who have adopted Marathi for all day-to-day activities outside their home. It will thus be seen that the Government of Mysore have not made out any case for transferring the City of Sholapur to Mysore.

5.3. It needs to be added that the people of Sholapur have expressed their desire to remain in Maharashtra. The Sholapur Municipality passed a resolution by a majority of 52 to 2 (2 remaining neutral) on 14th August 1954 for retention of the city in Maharashtra. Another resolution was passed on 19th April 1961. The latest resolution which was passed unanimously on 4th May 1967 stated that the Mysore Government's claim to Sholapur City is wrong and irrational, and is not supported by any fact. This resolution is reproduced in Appendix "B". Similar resolutions have also been passed by other institutions such as Co-operative Societies.

VI

AKALKOT

Akalkot taluka consists of three towns and 121 villages. According to the 1951 Census the total population of the taluka is 1,49,438. Out of this 34,871 are Marathi-speakers and 82,913 are Kannad-speakers. The former constitute 23·3 per cent. while the latter constitute 55·5 per cent. According to the 1961 Census the total population of this taluka is 1,75,333. Out of this 39,525 are Marathi-speakers and 99,872 are Kannad-speakers. The former constitute 22·5 per cent. while the latter constitute 56·9 per cent.

6.2. According to the earlier proposals, the Government of former Bombay State had proposed that the demarcation of boundary between the Bombay and Mysore States in the Akalkot Taluka wherein there is a majority of the Kannad-speaking people over the Marathi-speaking people and where such areas are compact should also be reviewed and adjusted so as to transfer to the Mysore State contiguous Kannad-speaking areas. In paragraph 6·157 of its Memorandum on the Maharashtra-Mysore Border Dispute submitted to the One-Man Commission on the 31st March 1967, the Government of Maharashtra have indicated that it would have no objection to the boundary being re-adjusted in the Akkalkot Taluka on the principles propounded by it in the said Memorandum provided those principles are equally applied in re-adjusting the boundary in the areas claimed by the Government of Maharashtra. The Government of Maharashtra have accordingly proposed to retain the Akalkot town and 28 villages (*vide* Appendix C) and to surrender 2 towns of Maindargi and Dudhani and 93 villages. The Government of Mysore have now proposed that the entire taluka may be transferred to that State.

6·3. The Akalkot State before it was merged in the former Bombay State, had 106 villages and an estimated area of 498 square miles. Its population in 1881 was 58,040. It had 7

villages detached from the compact area. Of these 7 villages 6 were in the Malsiras Sub-division of Sholapur and the village of Kurla in the Khatav Sub-division of Satara. Out of the total population of 58,040, 20,000 were Lingayats.

6.4. Akalkot Taluka is bounded on the North by the Osmanabad District of the Maharashtra State, on the east as well as on the south by Mysore State areas and on the west partly by the Bijapur District and partly by the South Sholapur Taluka of the Maharashtra State. It is relevant to point out that the Government of Mysore have sought for transfer of the former entire Sholapur Taluka also which consisted of the talukas of North Sholapur and South Sholapur. Even according to the proposals made by the Government of Bombay (Maharashtra), a substantial part of the South Sholapur Taluka would under certain circumstances be surrendered to the Government of Mysore. Even if that surrender takes place, the Akalkot Taluka would have contiguity with the Maharashtra State from the North, i.e. from the Osmanabad District. The contention of the Government of Mysore in paragraph 299 of its Memorandum that on the North also lies Kannad area is not therefore correct.

6.5. The contention of the Government of Mysore in paragraph 300 of their Memorandum that the Government of Maharashtra have conceded that 99 villages are Kannad-speaking and that they may be transferred to the Mysore State is not wholly true. The actual offer of transfer is only for 93 villages and 2 towns. Similarly the contention of that Government that the Government of Maharashtra's claim is to retain 25 villages including the town of Akalkot is not wholly correct. This Government have claimed to retain 28 villages and the Akolkot town.

6.6. With regard to the allegation in paragraph 301 of the Mysore Government's Memorandum that the former rulers of Akalkot discouraged or stifled Kannad, this Government state that they have no knowledge of the same and it is not clear on what basis the allegation of the Government of Mysore is made.

6.7. It is contended by the Government of Mysore in paragraph 303 of their Memorandum that even on linguistic grounds there is no justification to retain Akalkot town or the other villages by the Government of Maharashtra. The claim of the Government of Maharashtra for Akalkot town and the 28 villages (*vide* Appendix C) was based on the 1951 Census figures and the principles enunciated in the Memorandum of 25th June 1957. According to the principles of relative majority, contiguity and village as unit the Mysore Government's claim for Akalkot town and the said 28 villages is clearly untenable.

6.8. The Government of Mysore have in paragraph 304 of their Memorandum enunciated a new principle. That is that the former princely States which were "autonomous, organic, administrative units" should be treated on par with districts and hence as units for the purpose of re-organisation. In propounding this new principle the Mysore Government have relied on States Reorganisation Commission's following observation :—

"Districts have developed an organic and administrative unity and economic life of their own."

According to the Mysore Government the Indian States, like the British districts, had developed an organic and administrative unity and economic life of their own.

6.9. The question under consideration is regarding demarcation of the boundaries in the disputed areas between the two States of Maharashtra and Mysore. The charter of the One-Man Commission is linguistic homogeneity. The linguistic homogeneity cannot be achieved to the maximum extent by adopting either a district, a taluka or a princely State as a unit but it can be achieved only by adopting a unit smaller than any of these three. The inevitable conclusion is therefore that a village should be the unit for demarcation of the boundaries between the two States as proposed by the Government of Maharashtra. In view of this position, the principle enunciated by the Government of Mysore that a princely State should be adopted as a unit is untenable.

6.10. In connection with the new principle enunciated by the Mysore Government as above, it must also be pointed out that factually the territory of many an Indian State was not compact, but was scattered, British areas intervening between parts of the Indian State. It is thus that we find that various British districts in Maharashtra had enclaves within themselves of Indian State territory. It is not necessary to give any example because, as stated already, the Indian State of Akalkot owned some villages in Malsiras Taluka of the Sholapur District and one village in Khatav Taluka of Satara District. In these circumstances it would not be correct to talk of any organic, economic or administrative unity within the former State of Akalkot. The Mysore Government's contention about the organic unity of the former Akalkot State has therefore no factual foundation.

6.11. In paragraph 305 the Government of Mysore have stated that the Akalkot State would have been added to the Kannad District of Bijapur or Gulbarga if the reorganisation of States had taken place simultaneously with the merger of Indian States in the Union of India. This is purely guess work on the part of the Government of Mysore.

6.12. In paragraph 306 of their Memorandum the Government of Mysore have argued that the question of joining Akalkot to Karnatak did not receive any consideration at the hands of the States Reorganisation Commission because Akalkot was at that time only a taluka of the Sholapur District. That Government have therefore requested (*vide* also paragraph 309 of their Memorandum) the One-Man Commission specially to consider this issue and have opined that, on the basis of the Indian State being adopted as a unit, Akalkot State should be transferred to Mysore State. The merger of the former princely States took place as far back as 1948-49. If all Indian States were such organic, economic, administrative and independent units as they are now made out to be by the Mysore Government in their Memorandum and if it was necessary to ignore the processes of history between 1948 and 1956, surely the States Reorganisation Commission and Parliament would have noticed the importance of the subject and given due consideration to it. The Mysore

Government's contention that the processes of history should be ignored and that the One-Man Commission should consider their claim on a 1948-footing has no substance in it. These observations would dispose of the contentions in paragraph 309 also of the Memorandum.

6.13. Further, the present Akalkot taluka comprises villages not only from the princely Akalkot State but also villages from the princely Kurundwad State and villages of the old Sholapur taluka. Even assuming the princely State of Akkalkot had organic, economic and administrative unity as contended by the Mysore Government it is not clear how that unity is to be linked to the villages from the Kurundwad State as well as the villages from the old Sholapur taluka. The Mysore Government's claim to the present entire Akalkot taluka is therefore hardly consistent with the various arguments made in their Memorandum from time to time. This meets the arguments in paragraph 313 also of the Mysore Memorandum, in which it is contended that the components of Akalkot and the components of Kurundwad can be joined together and together considered as a unit.

6.14. In the first part of paragraph 307 of their Memorandum the Government of Mysore have continued the argument referred to above and then given the analogy of Coorg. The analogy of Coorg is however not on all fours with the case of Akalkot and Jath States. The important point of difference is that while Coorg was a part 'C' State under the Constitution when the States Reorganisation Commission considered its case, the Akkalkot and Jath States were not so.

6.15. In paragraph 308 of their Memorandum the Government of Mysore have stated that the States of Akalkot and Jath could as well have been included in the District of Bijapur immediately after their merger but the Government of former Bombay State summarily included them in the two Marathi districts of Sholapur and Sangli, respectively, without giving any consideration as to whether from the view-point of language, linking would be proper or not. It is pertinent to point out here that in 1948 the Bombay State was a trilingual State, the

languages being Marathi, Kannad and Gujarati and the Government of the State came from the areas of all these three languages. If it was administrative considerations which prevailed with the then Government and if even now the Mysore Government think of language as a subordinate and minor factor (please see paragraph 256 of their Memorandum) it is not clear how it can be contended that the linguistic considerations were not given sufficient weight in 1948 by the then Government. To describe the 1948 decision as a "summary" decision, as the Government of Mysore have done is therefore not correct.

6.16. In paragraph 311 of their Memorandum the Government of Mysore have stated that there has been little development in the taluka of Akalkot after its merger till now. It is also pointed out that there is not even now a good road from Dudhni to Akalkot even though on the way lies the other and bigger town of Maindargi. The statement that there has been little development in this taluka is too vague to answer and as regards road between Dudhni and Akalkot *via* Maindargi, there is a murum surface road at present.

6.17. In paragraph 314 the Government of Mysore have stated that Akalkot has as much trade relations with Gulbarga as it has with Sholapur and that Gulbarga is 50 miles by road and 45 miles by rail from Akalkot. Firstly the trade relations are not affected by the State boundaries. Secondly the Government of Mysore themselves have admitted that Akalkot has trade relations with Sholapur.

6.18. In paragraph 315 of the said Memorandum it is stated that in the population of Akalkot State in 1881, there were 20,000 Lingayats in a total population of 58,040 and that the social and cultural ties of these Lingayats were either with Kalyan or with people who are to be found in Bijapur, Raichur and Gulbarga. The linguistic percentages in any area are no doubt relevant in the present proceedings, but the same clearly cannot be said about the historical ties referred to by the Mysore Government. There are Lingayats in other parts of Maharashtra also, and all Lingayats are not Kannad-speakers.

6.19. In paragraph 316 the Government of Mysore relying on the 8 Kannad inscriptions available in the palace of the Maratha Chief, Akalkot, have concluded that there was Kannad language as also the influence of Kannad culture in this taluka. The answer to this kind of argument is that Marathi inscriptions are also available in the predominantly Kannad-speaking areas, and that the inscriptions do not prove the present language position.

6.20. In paragraph 317, the Government of Mysore have stated that the case of Akalkot town should be considered as on par with that of cities in the disputed areas. The Government of Mysore state that the linguistic complexion of a town will have to be determined not merely by the percentage of the people speaking one language or the other in the town itself but by the language spoken in the villages in the neighbourhood and under the influence of the town. According to the Census Map, Akalkot town is surrounded by Akalkot non-municipal area. According to the 1951 census figures, the population of the Akalkot municipal area was 18,112 and that of the non-municipal area was 785. Considering the small population of the non-municipal area, the reasonable course would be to take the municipal and non-municipal area together. If they are so taken, the percentage of Marathi-speaking people in the two areas was 45.8 and these two areas are surrounded by Marathi-speaking villages on the north-east, north and the west. The percentage of the Kannad-speaking people, on the other hand, in these two areas was only 23.5. In the 1961 census the percentage of the Marathi-speaking people has no doubt dropped to 36.7 and the percentage of the Kannad-speaking people has risen to 32.9. But their relative position remains unaltered and the two areas continue to be surrounded by Marathi-speaking villages to the north-east, the north and the west. The claim of the Government of Maharashtra for retention of the Akalkot town as well as its non-municipal area is, therefore, fully justified on the basis of the principles propounded by them. Further, all the 11 villages mentioned in paragraph 317 of the Memorandum of the Government of Mysore as surrounding

Akalkot town on its three sides, namely, east, south and west, have not been claimed by the State of Maharashtra. Out of them, only three are claimed, namely Naganhalli, Bagehalli and Dodyal, and they have been claimed on the ground that Marathi-speaking people have a relative majority in them. According to 1961 census, however, the Kannad-speaking people have acquired relative majority in Naganhalli and the Government of Maharashtra will have no objection to its transfer to the State of Mysore provided 1961 census figures are uniformly adopted as the basis for such transfers. It appears that the Government of former Bombay had claimed the village Itage through mistake. It need not be included in the State of Maharashtra now.

6.21. In paragraph 318, the Government of Mysore state that the cases of the villages Itage, Bagehalli and Banasgol are all on par. This statement is totally incorrect. According to 1951 census, while Itage had a relative majority of Kannad-speaking people, both Bagehalli and Banasgol had a relative majority of Marathi-speaking people. According to 1961 census, Itage has an absolute majority of Kannad-speaking people and Bagehalli and Banasgol have absolute majority of Marathi-speaking people. It will thus be seen that Itage will have to go to the State of Mysore and the villages Bagehalli and Banasgol will have to remain in the State of Maharashtra.

6.22. In paragraph 320, the Government of Mysore have stated that the town of Akalkot should be kept amidst its natural surroundings of Kannad areas and that no special consideration exists for its detachment by carving for it a narrow corridor on the north. The town of Akalkot can be detached only if it is a pocket. But as it is not, being surrounded by Marathi-speaking villages on the north-east, north and west, it will have to remain in the State of Maharashtra.

6.23. As regards the failure to declare Akkalkot taluka as bilingual mentioned in paragraph 322 of the Memorandum of the Mysore Government, the fact of the matter is that a major part of the Akkalkot taluka was offered by the Government of former

Bombay for being included in the State of Mysore immediately after the re-organisation of the States in 1956 and it was expected that this would take place soon and there would be no necessity to declare it as bilingual. It was, however, because of the attitude taken by the Government of Mysore that the major part of the Akkalkot taluka has still remained in the State of Maharashtra. Had they accepted the offer when it was made, the question of declaring it bilingual would not have survived at all.

6.24. The recommendations of the One-Man Commission will be determined mainly by the principle of linguistic homogeneity. It is however necessary to say a few words here about the public opinion in this taluka. There are two Maharashtra Assembly Constituencies which are relevant here. One is the Akalkot Constituency covering some villages from Akalkot taluka only, and the second is Akalkot-South Sholapur constituency, for the remaining villages in the Akalkot taluka and the whole of the South Sholapur taluka. There was no candidate sponsored by the Kannada Ekikaran Maha Samiti or any other Kannad body in any of the three General Elections of 1957, 1962 and 1967. As regards village panchayats almost all of them have passed resolutions expressing a desire to continue in the Maharashtra State. The municipalities of all the three towns namely, Akalkot, Maindargi and Dudhni, have also passed similar resolutions. The Taluka Panchayat Samiti also has passed a similar resolution. This position effectively proves the strong desire of the people to continue to remain in Maharashtra.

6.25. With regard to the allegations in paragraph 324 of the Mysore Government's Memorandum about Shri Pawate, it is enough to state that the conduct and promotion of Civil Judges are subject to the superintendence and control of the High Court and not of State Government.

VII

JATH TALUKA (Sangli District)

7.1. The present Jath taluka consists of 97 villages and the town of Jath. Its population in 1951 was 1,08,280, out of which 52.1 per cent. were Marathi-speaking and 40.2 per cent. Kannad-speaking. According to the 1961 Census, the population of the taluka including the Jath town is 1,38,983, out of which 54.3 per cent are Marathi-speaking and 37.7 per cent are Kannad-speaking. Out of 97 villages, the then Government of Bombay in their Memorandum of 25th June 1957 offered to transfer 44 villages to the Mysore State. Thus, 53 villages and the town of Jath are to remain in the Maharashtra State. In accordance with the said Memorandum, as stated already, Mysore Government's claim is for the entire taluka, i.e. they claim 53 villages more and the Jath town as well.

7.2. Paragraph 327 of the Mysore Memorandum gives the total boundary line of the whole taluka as 212 miles. If one considers the portion of the taluka which is to be retained with Maharashtra according to the Memorandum of 25th June 1957, the said length of 212 miles has clearly no significance. Similarly the paragraph in question gives the distances from Bijapur and Sangli to places in the Jath taluka. These distances also have no significance in the present proceedings.

7.3. With regard to paragraph 328 of the Mysore Government Memorandum, the question of a former princely State being considered as a 'unit' for the purpose of reorganisation has already been dealt with earlier in paragraphs 6.8 to 6.10.

7.4. Paragraph 329 of the Mysore Government Memorandum states that the Collector of Bijapur was the political agent for the State of Jath. This statement is not wholly correct. At one time the political agent was the Collector of Satara. The Collector of Bijapur came thereafter only for a few years. After him, the political agent was the Collector of Kolhapur.

7.5. Paragraph 331 of the Mysore Government Memorandum states that the forest area in Jath was being administered by the Sub-Divisional Forest Officer at Bagalkot in the Bijapur District. The position was that the forest in Jath was only of the scrub type and the forest which belonged to the old Sangli State fell into Belgaum District. The forest in Jath was thus given in the charge of the Sub-Divisional Officer at Bagalkot at the time of the merger, there being no Forest Officer in Sangli at the time of the merger.

7.6. Paragraph 333 of the said Memorandum states that the State of Jath came to be artificially made into a taluka of the South Satara District now called the Sangli District in 1948. The true position is that Jath was made into a taluka of the South Satara District on administrative grounds and there is no element of artificiality about it.

7.7. Paragraph 334 of the said Memorandum states that when linguistic divisions were formed for the purpose of the Indian National Congress, the State of Jath was a part of the Karnatak Provincial Congress Committee. The Provincial Congress Committees of the Indian National Congress were, however, for the British Indian provinces, and there were separate Committees of the Indian National Congress for Indian States. Further, jurisdictions of political parties have no relevance to the present discussion.

7.8. Paragraph 335 of the said Memorandum refers to the claims made by Karnatak regarding the Jath taluka. The then Government of Bombay considered these claims and voluntarily offered the Kannad speaking villages to the Mysore State by the Memorandum of 25th June 1957.

7.9. Paragraph 337 of the said Memorandum relates to the decision of the States Reorganisation Commission, with regard to Jath. All the points made here have been dealt with previously in the case of the Akalkot Taluka and it is not necessary to go over the same grounds again.

7.10. In paragraph 339 of the said Memorandum administrative convenience in support of the Mysore claim is sought to be established from the fact that the town of Jath is 55 miles from Sangli but only 40 miles from Bijapur and also from the fact that some time the Collector of Bijapur was the political agent of the State of Jath. The position about the political agent has been stated above in paragraph 7.4 and a little difference in the two distances given is not enough to establish any administrative convenience.

7.11. Paragraphs 340 and 341 of the said Memorandum mention some trade and social contacts. The statements are very vague and it is not possible to give any answer.

7.12. In paragraph 342 of the said Memorandum it is stated that Jath is very closely linked with Karnatak because some temples and swamis in Jath have devotees in Karnatak. The existence of Kannad population in the Jath taluka cannot be denied, but the fact that some temples attract Kannad people from outside has no significance. It does not establish any regular link as alleged between Jath and Karnatak. A shrine having devotees in different parts is a common occurrence in this country and it is neither possible nor necessary to join all such parts together administratively.

7.13. In this connection, it is really not necessary to refer to certain shrines in Maharashtra, but it would be enough to refer to the shrine of Saint Sai Baba in the Kopergaon Taluka of the Ahmednagar District who has devotees in all parts of India. They include many Kannad-speaking people also.

7.14. There is a reference again in paragraph 343 of the said Memorandum to another Deity Guddapura Danamma. The observations in the preceding paragraphs apply here also. The Mysore Government have further added that although the village Guddapur has a Kannad-speaking majority, it is claimed by Maharashtra. This is true but the claim is made because it is a pocket surrounded by Marathi-speaking villages. The Mysore

Government also say that "it would be saddest day for the devotees of this deity who are mostly in Karnatak, if it were to be made over to Maharashtra.". If this principle were accepted many non-Marathi speaking areas would have to be added to Maharashtra. Reference has already been made to Saint Sai Baba.

7.15. In paragraph 344 of the said Memorandum, the Marathi complexion of the Jath town and of the neighbouring areas in taluka is admitted, but it is stated at the same time that the town is surrounded by Kannad-speaking areas to its east and south. This statement is not correct. In 1951, there was only one surrounding village which was Kannad-speaking and that was to the east, being the village Walsang, and the other surrounding villages were Marathi-speaking and there were at least 9 such villages of Marathi-speaking people. In 1961, there was not a single Kannad-speaking village surrounding the Jath town.

7.16. Paragraph 347 of the said Memorandum refers to a temple of Yellama. In view of what has already been said about temples, it is not necessary to say anything more here.

7.17. In paragraph 348 of the Memorandum it is stated that the Karanatak Ekikaran Samiti mentions in its Memorandum to the One-Man Commission that "just after the merger, the rise in the Kannad Schools was from 2 to 60.". The Mysore Government's own comments on this are that "Even this was due mostly to the enthusiasm of and organization by the public. That shows the popular desire for learning Kannada and for associating themselves with Karnataka". It is not clear whether this increase is in the villages proposed for transfer to the Mysore State or otherwise. On the other hand a Memorandum submitted to the States Reorganisation Commission by the Committee of the Marathi-speaking people, Jath Taluka on 27th May 1954, contains the following :—

"There are Kannad schools only in 17 villages. They are mainly in eastern part. In spite of Kannada propaganda, this number is since decreasing."

7.18. Paragraph 349 of the Mysore Government Memorandum complains that Jath Taluka has not yet been treated as bilingual. This question has already been dealt with in paragraph 3.15.

7.19. The public opinion in the villages which are proposed to be retained with Maharashtra, is over-whelmingly in favour of Maharashtra and they should therefore be retained in Maharashtra on the ground of the wishes of the people as well.

* * *

VIII

CHANDGAD TALUKA

It is clear that the Government of Mysore do not claim Chandgad taluka on linguistic grounds. This taluka had majority of 92.4 per cent. of Marathi-speaking people in 1951 Census and that majority has increased in 1961 Census to 93 per cent. The charter of the Commission is linguistic homogeneity and the majority of the Marathi-speaking people is so overwhelming in this taluka that there will be no alternative but to retain it in the State of Maharashtra. Even the reasons given by the Mysore Government which are dealt with below are not so compelling as to justify its inclusion in the State of Mysore.

8.2. The Government of Mysore claim that taluka on the following grounds :—

- (i) Administrative convenience (paragraphs 351-352),
- (ii) Trade links with Belgaum (paragraph 353),
- (iii) Lack of educational, medical and legal facilities only available in Belgaum (paragraph 354),
- (iv) Food deficit which can only be made good by Belgaum (paragraph 355),
- (v) It is a part of Malnad (paragraph 355), and
- (vi) Bauxite required for aluminium factory to be opened in Belgaum is available in large quantities in this taluka (paragraph 357).

8.3. As regards administrative inconvenience, there has never been any complaint from the people of Chandgad that it cannot be conveniently administered by the Government of Maharashtra. Had there been any inconvenience, there would certainly have been agitation but no such agitation has ever taken place. In regard to paragraph 352 of the Mysore Memorandum, it is stated that the nearest railway station to Chandgad

is Belgaum and that there is no good road between Chandgad and Kolhapur and Chandgad people have necessarily to go to Kolhapur *via* Belgaum. It is not true that the people of Chandgad have necessarily to go *via* Belgaum to Kolhapur. As admitted by the Mysore Government there is a road from Chandgad to Kolhapur *via* Gadhinglaj and there is a State Transport Bus Service running on the road. The people of Chandgad can also go to Kolhapur *via* Belgaum by road or by rail but that does not mean that no direct communication exists between Chandgad and Kolhapur.

8.4. The Government of Mysore have adduced no evidence to show that the trade of Chandgad with Belgaum has been adversely affected because Chandgad is not in the State of Mysore nor have the people made any such complaint. It is obvious therefore that the trade has gone on unaffected and it is not necessary to include Chandgad in the State of Mysore for this reason.

8.5. As regards educational, medical and legal facilities, it has to be borne in mind that Chandgad is a hilly, backward taluka full of forest. Such talukas have always to depend on nearby places wherever they are. The people have also not complained that because of the lack of these facilities they should be included in the State of Mysore.

8.6. As regards food, the whole State of Maharashtra is deficit and many places in it get their food from outside. Further the food zones are created by the Government of India over which the Government of Maharashtra have no control. If the Government of India abolish the present zones or create a single zone of Maharashtra and Mysore, these difficulties will not exist. Moreover, the zones themselves are temporary and no decision can be based on such temporary difficulties.

8.7. There are many areas similar to Malnad in the State of Maharashtra and this cannot, therefore, become a ground for transferring Chandgad taluka to Mysore. If all areas like Mysore Malnad are to be brought together, large areas from the State of Maharashtra stretching from Chandgad in the south to Thana in the north will have to be included in the Mysore State.

8.8. The aluminium factory has yet to start and it is not necessary for the areas producing raw materials to be in the same State in which the factory is situated. There are factories all over the country, which draw their material from various parts of the country.

8.9. If the arguments advanced by the Mysore State are accepted they would be grounds for including Belgaum in the State of Maharashtra rather than including the Chandgad taluka in the State of Mysore, and the State of Maharashtra has already claimed the inclusion of Belgaum in the State of Maharashtra.

APPENDIX ' A '

*(Vide paragraph 4-5)*Letter*Subject.*—Territorial changes—

Splitting up of Sholapur Taluka into two Talukas and reconstitution of Sub-Divisions.

No. ADM-281

Sholapur, 5th September 1944.

From

J. M. Corin, Esquire, I.C.S.,
Collector of Sholapur.

To

The Commissioner, C. D., Poona.

Reference.—Your D. O. dated 18th July 1944.

I submit herewith detailed proposals for—

- (a) the re-organization of the Prants in this District ;
- (b) the division of Sholapur Taluka into two ;
- (c) the allotment of the City Survey Work in Sholapur City to one of the two Mamlatdars now proposed for the sub-divided Sholapur Taluka.

The proposed changes are necessary for many reasons, some of them overlapping. They are summarised below.

2. At present the Pandharpur Prant has five Talukas (Pandharpur, Sangola, Malsiras, Madha and Karmala), and the Sholapur Prant has only Sholapur and Barsi, the Prant Officer being also City Survey Officer for Sholapur City. This allocation of the work was decided upon in 1940 (*vide* G. R., R. D., No. 4378/39, dated 23rd September 1940). Conditions have since changed, and the Pandharpur Prant is now unmanageably large. If the Prant Officer is to exercise the proper degree of supervision over supply and procurement work within his charge, and to have the detailed knowledge of crop prospects and yields so essential to supply work.

3. The Sholapur Prant, moreover, is too light, particularly if the Prant Officer is relieved (as I propose that he should be see below) of the City Survey work.

4. Sholapur Taluka is much too large for efficient administration by one Mamlatdar, the more so in view of the Land Development work now in progress and likely to be extended in the near future. At present the Taluka has 152 villages, the District Headquarter town, two irrigation tanks, and and a large scarcity area. There is urgent reason therefore to divide this unwieldy area into two, and I submit alternative plans for this in Appendices B-E with a note on the relative merits of each in Appendix A.

5. At present the Prant Officer, Sholapur Division has to do the City Survey Work for Sholapur City. In these days I do not think this imposition justifiable, as I have said above, I think he must take over part of the unwieldy Pandharpur Prant, and I would therefore press for the appointment as City Survey Officer of one of the two Mamlatdars to be appointed for the sub-divided Sholapur Taluka. I understand that Mamlatdar does this work in Poona. A percentage check of the surveyor's work is his main duty, and the Huzur Deputy Collector, now that there are two Resident Magistrates, could probably find the time to check a further percentage of the work checked by the Mamlatdar (as I understand the Collector's Personal Assistant does in Poona).

6. If the above proposals are accepted, I would propose that the Prants be sub-divided as follows :—

Northern Division.—Karmala, Madha, Barsi and Sholapur (northern part).

Southern Division.—Pandharprur, Sangola, Malsiras and Sholapur (Southern eventual Taluka headquarter possibly at Mandrup).

This sub-division, which I have discussed at length with both Prant Officers, will make for greater efficiency, as communications between the three northern Talukas are much easier than they are e.g. between Sangola and Karmala, Barsi, Madha and Karmala should be in one Prant. I have added the lighter northern part of Sholapur Taluka in order to make the work less unequal than it would be if all the present Sholapur Taluka were added to either of the Prants.

7. In the hope that the proposals will be accepted earlier, I venture to submit a draft Government Resolution (Notification) on the assumption that you will agree that Plan II (Appendix C) is the best.

8. I add a brief note in Appendix F on the question of State enclaves. I banish this awkward problem to an Appendix in the hope that there it will not delay the early decision which I hope for on the main proposals.

(Signed) J. M. Corin,
Collector of Sholapur.

Below Collector of Sholapur's letter No. A.D.M. 251, dated September 5th 1944.

No. A.D.M 277,
Poona, September 11, 1944.

Submitted to Government.

The necessity of giving relief to Sholapur Taluka has been obvious for some time. The figures given by Mr. Corin bring out this clearly but perhaps a truer perspective of the situation can be obtained by comparing the position with Poona. A city of this size developing at this rate requires the entire attention of a Mamlatdar under a lightly worked Prant Officer. Poona City Taluka takes in 20 villages in the immediate neighbourhood of Poona and requires the attention of really good and experienced Mamlatdar. Even so the work is so different and complicated that we have certainly not got to the stage of efficiency here that such an area requires. There are still cases of uncontrolled development and loss of Government revenue. Omitting a similar area in the case of Sholapur there would remain a taluka completely surrounding this City Taluka as Haveli does in the case of Poona. It would consist of 132 villages and this figure itself shows the absurdity of the present position. A normal deshi taluka consists of 70 to 80 of these heavy deshi villages and when such a taluka has got other troubles—irrigation, the neighbourhood of a large city or villages dispersed at a distance in a Native State we regard it as a heavy taluka. We have in short in the present Sholapur Taluka the makings of 3 talukas.

The difficulty has been under consideration for some time and we have tried all the usual ways that would not mean an increase of expenditure to Government. It has in the first place to be emphasized that it is impossible to give relief by passing over any of the area under the present Sholapur Taluka to any of the neighbouring talukas. The very situation would make the working of any such proposal difficult. But apart from this practically all these Sholapur Talukas are on the heavy side already and our present plans for concentrated development here puts this suggestion out of consideration. In effect what may be called a long distant part of our problem is how to give relief to some of these Talukas when our development activities get really into operation. Barsi I can see no way of helping although it requires help, but the difficulties in administering the extensive areas of Sangola and Karmala particularly will certainly have to be met by the creation of another taluka possibly with Head Quarter at Mohol when our difficulties become clearer. Mr. Corin's scheme in one point goes back to the old scheme of using the Huzur Deputy Collector which was condemned very rightly by every one who has had any experience of the problem. I return to this point later and only mention it here as it was considered fully in connection with one of our first proposed solutions—that of

a City Mahal without a treasury. That was given up owing to (1) treasury difficulties, (2) the fact that this work requires an exceptionally experienced Revenue Officer in charge and (3) the Huzur Deputy Collector and City Magistrate simply could not do the amount of detailed work that the idea envisaged. This led to our present system—a Superintendent to be selected and kept here working almost directly under a Prant Officer whose charge had been lightened to allow him to do so. This was undoubtedly a makeshift arrangement particularly in that it requires far too much time of a Deputy Collector for work that should be done by a Mamlatdar. Also the work in the other Prant—always heavy has now become impossible with our supply and development activities.

Our problem therefore is plain—to divide up the present Sholapur Taluka to give the immediate assistance necessary to the Mamlatdar and the Prant Officers in such a fashion as will fit in with our Post-War Scheme for a third Taluka for this area. It seems to me that Mr. Corin's proposal No. II (Appendix 'C') offers the most hopeful solution both for our immediate purposes and our future plans.

I also agree with Mr. Corin's distribution of the Talukas among the Prants; which follows the natural lines. There is only one point that I have to disagree with basically—the suggestion to bring back the Huzur Deputy Collector and the City Magistrate as the final controlling officer over the city Revenue work. In fact Mr. Corin's whole outlook on this subject is very obviously quite out of date. His remarks at the beginning of paragraph 5 of his forwarding memorandum that the City Survey work of Sholapur is an imposition on a Prant Officer suggests a view of City Development and Revenue work that I thought was dead 20 years ago. This is a Prant Officer's duty in any City Survey area and the only difference in the case of a city of the size of Sholapur is that it requires continual attention in addition from the Collector himself. Apart from this either as Huzur Deputy Collector or City Magistrate of a city of the size and Police complexities of Sholapur this officer has got a heavier job than he can deal with adequately even now. It is quite unsound to give him any extra work and to give him back the heavy City Survey work will merely mean that the whole of the important development work around Sholapur City will again remain quite uncontrolled and our revenue work neglected. The Huzur Deputy Collector is in addition according to our present system an old gentleman who cannot be expected to give the hard physical work that this job requires. A further point which is to me almost conclusive against the proposal is that it puts the Mamlatdar under two Prants—a division that is fatal. With the Mamlatdar in charge of the City Survey (and the City Survey Superintendent under him) I consider that the Northern Prant Officer could be given this work. This will make the Northern Prant a heavy charge undoubtedly but it will not be an impossible one. Much of the detailed check (either City Survey or Development) and the bringing of our City System here upto date could be done in the off-season.

The proposal will not mean anything extra in the way of Treasury or additional cells. In fact the Kacheri can be located in a rented place until we have had time to deal with the situation at our leisure. The proposal will mean one extra Mamlatdar and Aval Karkun and about 6 clerks which in present circumstances of supply, etc., may have to be increased by an additional Aval Karkun for Treasury and Supply work and two or more extra clerks of which the cost will be as under :—

	Rs.	Average cost
		Rs.
Mamlatdar (2nd grade) ..	200—15/2—260	239·75
Aval Karkun Grade ..	85—5/2—100	96·00
6 Clerks Grade ..	25—5/2—55	40·57 × 6

I would conclude by reminding Government that in our extension of Circles, Sholapur Taluka has had to be given 8 Circles (with a super Circle in Sholapur City itself). Each of these circles is a heavy Circle in comparison with the Circles in other Districts. Our normal number of circles in each Taluka at present is 4 to 6. We do therefore want urgent help and I would request that very early orders of Government be issued.

(Signed),
Commissioner, C. D.

Territorial changes.

Sholapur district.

Splitting up of Sholapur taluka into two talukas and redistribution of sub-divisions of Sholapur district.

GOVERNMENT OF BOMBAY

REVENUE DEPARTMENT

Resolution No. 4378/39

Bombay Castle, 30th September 1944

Read Government Resolution No. 4378/39, dated the 23rd September 1940.

Letter from the Collector of Sholapur, No. A.D.M. 281, dated the 5th September 1944.

Memorandum from the Commissioner, C. D. No. A.D.M. 2/77, dated the 11th September 1944.

RESOLUTION.—It has been found that Sholapur taluka is too large for efficient administration by one mamlatdar, the more so in view of its land development, supply and other problems. Government is therefore pleased to split up the taluka into two talukas, with headquarters at Sholapur, viz. North Sholapur and South Sholapur, with effect from 1st October 1944, and to sanction the following additional establishment till 28th February 1945 in the first instance :—

Establishment		Pay-scales	
		Rs.	
Mamlatdar (2nd grade)	200—15/2—260.
Aval Karkun	85—5/2—100.
6 Clerks	25—5/2—55.

2. The requisite notification showing the distribution of villages, at present included in Sholapur taluka, between the two talukas should be published in the *Bombay Government Gazette*.

3. The extra charge on this account which is debitable to the head “25, General Administration”, should be taken into consideration while submitting the revised estimates for the current year.

4. Consequent on the splitting up of Sholapur taluka, the sub-divisions of Sholapur district should be redistributed as follows:—

Northern Prant.

Karmala, Madha, Barsi and North Sholapur.

Southern Prant.

Pandharpur, Sangola, Malsiras and South Sholapur.

The Prant Officer, N. D., should also continue to work as City Survey Officer as heretofore.

By order of the Governor of Bombay,

(Signed) M. J. DESAI,
For Secretary to Government.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT

Bombay Castle, 30th September 1944

No. 4378/39.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 7 of the Bombay Land Revenue Code, 1879 (Bom. V of 1879), the Government of Bombay is pleased to direct that, with effect from the 1st October 1944, the present Sholapur Taluka comprising of 152 villages in Sholapur district shall be split up into two talukas, viz. North Sholapur Taluka and South Sholapur Taluka of the said Sholapur District each containing the villages as shown below :—

Villages in the North Sholapur Taluka.

(1) Sholapur, (2) Banegaon, (3) Bhogaon, (4) Hiparge, (S.), (5) Pakhi, (6) Tirhe, (7) Kavathe, (8) Belati, (9) Degaon, (10) Hiraj, (11) Bale, (12) Kegaon, (13) Kondi, (14) Chincholi (Kati), (15) Sawaleshwar, (16) Arjunsod, (17) Lamboti, (18) Shirapur (Sholapur), (19) Akole (Kati), (20) Mardi, (21) Gulwanchi, (22) Khed, (23) Shelgi, (24) Dahitne, (25) Haglur, (26) Ule, (27) Taratgaon (Mardi), (28) Kasegaon, (29) Takalgaon, (30) Raleras, (31) Honsal, (32) Hiparge (Mardi), (33) Vadaji, (34) Tandulwadi, (35) Vadale, (36) Darfal, (37) Boramani, (38) Ekruke, (39) Arali Bk. (40) Mangrul, (41) Kakrambe, (42) Tadawale, (43) Kalegaon, (44) Soregaon, (45) Dongaon, (46) Samshapur, (47) Nandur, (48) Mulegaon, (49) Sangdari, (50) Kumathe, (51) Dodi, (52) Pathari, (53) Telgaon-Sholapur.

Villages in the South Sholapur Taluka.

(1) Arbali, (2) Miri, (3) Vatwate, (4) Yenaki, (5) Korawali, (6) Gunjegaon, (7) Akole (Mandrup), (8) Kusur, (9) Khanapur, (10) Telgaon (Mandrup), (11) Bhandarkaothe, (12) Balagi, (13) Antroli, (14) Vinchur, (15) Kandalgaon, (16) Vangi, (17) Mangoli, (18) Nimbargi, (19) Malkaothe, (20) Sadeapur, (21) Lavangi, (22) Karkal, (23) Kurghot, (24) Auj-Mandrup, (25) Takali, (26) Chinchpur, (27) Nandani, (28) Barur, (29) Borsur, (30) Bolkaothe, (31) Kudal, (32) Hattarsang, (33) Bandalgi, (34) Aurad, (35) Vadakbal, (36) Honmurgi, (37) Birnal, (38) Vadapur, (39) Mandrup, (40) Yelegaon, (41) Jangaon Bk., (42) Jangaon Khurd, (43) Irawade Bk., (44) Shirapur (Mohol), (45) Peertakali, (46) Dadpur, (47) Parmeshwar-Pimpri, (48) Shingoli, (49) Taratgaon (Mohol), (50) Kamati Kd., (51) Kamati Bk., (52) Wagholi, (53) Sohale, (54) Kotale, (55) Vaddegaon, (56) Ardhanari, (57) Ichagaon, (58) Ghodeshwar, (59) Madre, (60) Chandrabal, (61) Sindkhed, (62) Rajur, (63) Sanjwad, (64) Aherwadi, (65) Bankalgi, (66) Tilehal, (67) Borul, (68) Kanbas, (69) Shirwal, (70) Alegaon, (71) Ingalgi, (72) Auj (Aherwadi), (73) Acheagaon, (74) Shingadgaon, (75) Hipale, (76) Hotgi, (77) Hattur, (78) Valsang,

(79) Tirth, (80) Dindur, (81) Chincholi (Aherwadi), (82) Rampur, (83) Vadgaon, (84) Dhotri, (85) Musti, (86) Shirpanhalli, (87) Darganhalli, (88) Kardehalli, (89) Togarhalli, (90) Gurdehalli, (91) Hanamgaon, (92) Yetnal, (93) Kumbhari, (94) Mugali, (95) Ibrampur, (96) Hadalgi, (97) Salgar, (98) Kesarjavalge, (99) Sawatkhed.

By order of the Governor of Bombay,

(Signed) M. J. DESAI,
Secretary.

* * *

APPENDIX 'B'

(Vide paragraph 5-3)

सोलापूर महानगरपालिकेच्या स. सा. सभा (प्रथम सोमवार, दि. २० मार्च १९६७ रोजी झालेली व गुरुवार, दि. २० एप्रिल १९६७ रोजी तहकूब झालेली) गुरुवार, दि. ४ मे १९६७ रोजी दुपारी ४-०० (चार) वाजता महानगरपालिका सभागृहात भरली होती. तिच्या इतिवृत्तातील लागू-पुस्तता उतारा.

विषय

ठराव

(१९२) सोलापूर शहराचे महाराष्ट्राची असलेले अतुट संबंध, भौगोलिक सलगता, बहुसंख्याकांची मराठी भाषा व लोकेच्छा या अनुषंगाने सोलापूर शहर हे महाराष्ट्राचेच आहे याबाबत मा. सदस्यांची सूचना मंजुरीसाठी.

(१४) दिनांक १४ ऑगस्ट १९५४ व दिनांक १९ एप्रिल १९६१ रोजी सोलापूर महानगरपालिकेने सोलापूर शहर व जिल्हा महाराष्ट्रातच ठेवावा अशा अर्थी ठराव पूर्वीच केले आहेत. त्यास अनुसरूनच आम्ही पुन्हा ठराव करतो की, मध्यवर्ती सरकारने या प्रस्ताबाबत बराच उशीर केला आहे. याबाबत खेद होतो व आता एकसदस्य कमिशनचे काम चालू होऊन निर्णय घेणेची वेळ जवळ आली आहे. ही महानगरपालिका मध्यवर्ती सरकारकडे आग्रहपूर्वक मागणी करून अशी विनंती करित आहे की, आता हा प्रश्न निकालात काढावा व खेडे हे घटक, भौगोलिक सलगता, बहुसंख्याकांची भाषा व लोकेच्छा हे प्रमाण मानून हा प्रश्न निकालात काढावा.

माजी न्यायमूर्ती ना. मेहेरवंद महाजन यांचे एकसदस्य कमिशन मध्यवर्ती सरकारने नेमले आहे. या एकसदस्य कमिशनसमोर आपल्या महानगरपालिकेच्या वतीने (१) मा. महापौर, (२) मा. उपमहापौर, (३) मा. भोगडे, (४) मा. कारमासे, (५) मा. होनपारखे, (६) मा. येवलेकर, (७) मा. बुरगल, (८) मा. सौ. ठोकळ, (९) मा. तुळसे, (१०) मा. मुनाळे, (११) मा. ई. टी. माने, (१२) मा. बनशेट्टी,

विषय

ठराव

(१३) मा. जोशी, यांनी सोलापूर शहराचे महाराष्ट्राशी असलेले अतुट संबंध, भौगोलिक सलगता, बहुसंख्यांकांची मराठी भाषा, लोकेच्छा व नगरपालिकेने पूर्वी केलेले ठराव, यांच्या अनुषंगाने व या ठरावात व्यक्त केलेल्या मतास अनुसरून निवेदन द्यावे, कागदपत्रे हजर करावीत, साक्ष नोंदवावी व सोलापूर शहर हे महाराष्ट्राचेच आहे, हे कमिशनला पटवून द्यावे. सोलापूर शहर हे निर्विवाद महाराष्ट्रातीलच आहे याचा ठाम पुनरुच्चार ही सभा करित आहे. या शहरावर म्हैसूर सरकारने सांगितलेला हक्क चुकीचा, दोषास्पद व अवास्तव आहे, व त्यास कोणताही, कसलाही आधार नाही हे कमिशनपुढे निवेदन रूपाने सादर करावे.

सदर ठराव एकमताने पास झाला.

नगरसचिव कार्यालय :
सोलापूर महानगरपालिका,
दिनांक ४ मे १९६७.

श्री. आ. पुंजारी,
नगरसचिव,
सोलापूर महानगरपालिका.

खरी नक्कल

(सही)

नगरसचिव
सोलापूर महानगरपालिका

* * *

APPENDIX C

(Vide paragraph 6·2)

Statement showing the villages from Akkalkot Taluka proposed to be retained with the Maharashtra State.

Serial No.	Name of the Village/Town		Code No. (1951 Census)
1	2		3
	<i>Towns</i>		
1	Akkalkot Municipality	16-VI
	<i>Villages</i>		
1	Akkalkot Non-Municipal Area	1
2	Naganhali	3
3	Itage	7*
4	Hingani	11
5	Kalegaon	12
6	Bagehalli	18
7	Hasapur	22
8	Dodyal	25
9	Karjal	28
10	Dahitane	69
11	Barhanpur	70
12	Pitapur	71
13	Akatnal	75
14	Arali	76
15	Dombarjavalge	78
16	Motyal	80
17	Shindkhed	81
18	Basavgir	82
19	Chungi	83
20	Sultanpur	84
21	Kurnur	85
22	Kajikanbas	86
23	Shirwal	87
24	Saphale	88
25	Shirsi	89
26	Badole (Bk.)	91
27	Sangavi (Bk.)	93
28	Sangavi (Kh.)	94
29	Banasgol	95

*Village Itage which came to be claimed in 1967 is proposed to be surrendered by the Government of Maharashtra to the Government of Mysore.