

LINGUISTIC MAHARASHTRA.

(Being Geographical, Ethnological, Historical and Statistical
Description of Contiguous Territory Inhabited by
Marathi-Speaking Population).

In The Form Of
Replies by the Brihan-Maharashtriya
Karyalaya, Sangli.

To The Questionnaire

Issued by
Linguistic Provinces Commission.

(Price-Rs. 1/-

Linguistic Provinces are the Age-tied Device To set-up Administrative Units.

The administration of the new born Bharata Khanda, being a big continent, will be unwieldy if managed entirely through Centre alone and therefore it has been an age old tradition to decentralise it among sub-divisions, called Mandals, Subhas, Prants, and provinces etc.

[Continued on cover page 3]

Brihan--Maharashtriya Karyalaya, Sangli

(a) The Karyalaya aims at collecting material to be helpful to write an Enclopaedic Gazetteer or Maharashtra.

(b) In the last 15 years the Karyalaya has brought to light nearly 40 new points so far not touched.

(c) In the last 8 years nearly 15 papers have been read before The Gatherings of the Orientalists such as, The All India Oriental Conference, The Indian History Congress, The Deccan History Conference. More than half of these have been printed in the Proceedings Volumes of these bodies and in The Commemoration Volumes, and the rest are on the way to press.

(d) The Success of the conclusions so far reached is mainly due to the actual field work and surveys conducted to verify those derived from the recorded evidence.

(e) The Karyalaya has prepared slides and explanatory synopsis to be exhibited on the screen with the help of epidiascope to impress the value and importance of the researches upon the audience.

(f) As a nation-building factor the study of history ranks amongst the forefront subjects in the curriculum of the studies in the Colleges and Universities; as such the efforts of the Karyalaya have their own value from the nation-building point of view.

(g) The material presented in this brochure is the result of studies and researches conducted to survey the present-day state of things of the people, their social status, language, and the region of Maharashtra.

Important Results of 15 years' Investigations

Subjects newly brought to light	Relevant Maps Serial No.
1 Extent of Maharashtra in the 6th century of the Shaka era 1
2 Extent of Trilinga i. e. Andhra 2
3 Kuntala-Southern Maharashtra—Karnatak 3
4 Vidarbha of the 1st century of the Shaka era 4
5 Colonization of Maharashtra 5
6 Divisions of Maharashtra in the ancient times 6
7 Maharashtra and Maharashtraiyans as described by Huen-Tsiang
8 History of Maharashtri Prakrit 7
9 Attachment and service to Maharashtri by the non-Vaidikas
10 Maharashtri Apabhramsha and its service by the Jains
11 Language of Maharashtra — its third stage 8
12 Jambu, Motala and Kapil Brahmins
13 Kukanas—Kunabi Marthas
14 Andhra Brahmins
15 Lewa Kunabis — Lewa Gujars
16 Halabas, Powars, Brahmins, Marathas and Mahars in Chhattisgarh
17 Extension of Maharashtra—South Canara to Trivendrum 9
18 Survey of Maharashtraiyans in Gujarat
19 Grant to Agra College by Mahadaji Shinde 10
20 Saurashtra Brahmins of Madura
21 Dialects of Maharashtra language 11
22 Caste settlers of Maharashtra 12
23 History of the names of the language of Maharashtra

Statement submitted on 4-11-1948 to the Linguistic Provinces Commission by Shri Shan. Ra. Shende representing Brihan-Maharashtriya Karyalaya, Sangli.

1. The Brihan-Maharashtriya Karyalaya urges upon the Commission to recommend to the Constituent Assembly not to delay the question of reshuffling the existing provinces in Southern India on Linguistic basis. Postponment of this issue will create bitterness among the peoples.

2. Maharashtra on the grounds of population, area and revenue is on the sound footing. (vide page 44)

Area Sq. Miles-	population in 1941	Revenue receipts for 1945-46
1,363,74	2, 91, 74, 025	36, 94, 45, 890

And therefore, it deserves to be formed into a (state) New Province in the Indian Federation.

3. We once again stress the point that this Commission should emphasize the creation of Linguistic Provinces of Maha-Gujarat, Mahakosal and Tamil Nad also, without which the redistribution of Southern India on linguistic basis will remain incomplete.

4. We are totally against any suggestion of giving sub-province either to Maha-Vidarbha or to Bombay within the linguistic province of Maharashtra or a separate province for either of them on the grounds;

- (a) if such sub-provinces or separate provinces will come into existence the very object of the formation of linguistic province within the linguistic area Maharashtra will be defeated by disturbing, homogeneity, and solidarity of Marathi speaking population and area;
- (b) creation of either of them (i) will prove unhealthy and will result in creating mutual distrust and disharmony and will make them rivals and enemies of one another and (ii) will make all administrative units weak and create administrative difficulties.

5. We here draw your attention to the fact that:-

- (a) the Samyukta Maharashtra Parishad of Poona is the only representative body of the entire Maharashtra inclusive of Maha-Vidarbha and Bombay and it came into existence to speak on behalf of all of them and to do whatever is necessary in this matter. It has on no occasion accepted either of these suggestions or authorised any of its deputies to press such suggestions before this Commission.
- (b) that the special sessions of the representatives of all parts of Maharashtra from Nagpur to Karwar recently convened (16th and 17th of November 1948) in Bombay by the Samyukta Maharashtra Parishad did not sanction such suggestions nor authorised its deputies to press them.

We therefore urge upon you not to favour any suggestions made to you regarding sub-province or separate province either for Maha-Vidarbha or Bombay on behalf of a body or a section of people or by any individual.

6. We are aware that people of Maha-Vidarbha want certain of their local interests guarded, and we, therefore, suggest to the Commission to recommend some administrative arrangement on the lines of an office of the Secretary for Scotland in the Govt. of United Kingdom.

7. Bombay cannot be and should not be separated from Maharashtra being its integral part (vid. pp. 22 to 24, our answer to question no. 20).

- (a) By language statistics Marathi speakers are 52.92 % while Gujarathi speakers are 19.86 % (Vide Table XIX)
- (b) That the composition of population of Bombay due to migrations to the City is as:—Maharashtra provided 436 persons out of every 754 migrants while only 84 out of 754 persons by Gujarath. (Vide Table XX)
- (c) The language statistics of this City for 1941 or for subsequent years, is not available and therefore, to meet this difficulty we have requested the Schools Committee of Bombay to furnish us with the numbers of pupils attending the various schools and the figures supplied to us as on 1-1-43 and 1-8-43

shows the percentage of pupils in Marathi schools was 62.67% in 1943 while it has risen to 63.99% in August 1948. while that of pupils in Gujarati schools were and are near about, 15 percent (Vide Table No. XXI.)

8. A word to the Capitalist of today in Bombay:-

- (a) They have first entered Bombay as Adatis or Agents of the English traders and made money and as its result they have today become capitalists. They were not capitalists when they came here.
- (b) They will also be aware that even then the Parsis were first to reach the ladder. Bhatias later on succeeded the Parsis. The Bania Gujarathis have replaced the Bhatias and now the Marwadis are in race with the Gujarathi Banias. This shows none of them is stable in the business field.
- (c) There is every chance that the Gujarathis and the Marwadis will fade some day as other non-Maharastriyans have faded in the past.
- (d) They will also take note that about 2 or 3 decades ago there were very few worth noting Maharashtrian Businessmen even in Girgaon Area. But today they number in hundreds. They are well aware that there are today more than a dozen Maharastriyans who are masters of lacs of rupees and they (Maha-
rastriyans) : are sure to push their way ahead

in the near future. To quote here an instance for their information we say:

About 2 or 3 years ago a dozen Maharashtra laymen have dared to purchase an American Business Corporation worth one and half Crore of rupees.

- (e) Today the so called capitalists of Bombay are here to make money. It is wrong to say that they have built Bombay. It is the creation of the British traders and not of the so called capitalists. These money makers will run away from Bombay the next day when they will find investment of capital in Bombay will not yield profits.
- (f) They must bear in mind that they are living in Maharashtra. Day by day they are adopting Maharashtra culture and they know and speak Marathi quite well. They must therefore behave as naturalized Maharastriyans as their other countrymen are doing for generations together.



Foreword.

The Brihan Mahashtriya Karyalaya of Sangli, resolved at its meeting held on 19th Aught, 1948 to submit replies to the Questinnaire issued by The Linguistic Provinces Commission appointed by the President of The Indian Constituent Assembly. The Chairman of the Karyalaya, the Secretary Mr. Shan. Ra. Shende, and Prof. P. M. Limaye were authorised by the meeting to draw up and submit replies to the Commission.

The first instalment of replies was forwarded to the Commission in last week of that month.

At a subsequent meeting of the Karyalaya, it was decided to have the full text of replies printed for wider circulation. The present brochure 'Linguistic Maharashtra' is the outcome of that decision.

Messrs. Shende and Limaye have shouldered the main responsibility of preparing the replies : Mr. Shende, by way of supplying materials, and Prof. Limaye by way of giving proper shape to these materials. Mr. Shende has been a well-known student of this subject for a long time, and has collected valuable materials bearing on it.

It is hoped that the brochure will be found helpful for a good understanding of the question of Linguistic Maharashtra.

The writers of the present brochure desire to record their sence of obligation to the Sanyukta Maharashtra Parishad of Poona for allowing them to use revenue figures from the book recently published by it.

The Karyalaya is highly indebted to its sympathisers for their generous support in bringing out this book-let.

Sangli,

V. N. Desai,

10th Oct. ,1948.

Chairman, Bri. Maha. Karyalaya,
Sangli.

Dr. V. N. Desai,
L. M. & S,
Chairman.
Shan. Ra. Shende.
Secretary.

Brihan-Maharashtriya
Karyalaya
Sangli (Maharashtra)
10th Oct. 1948.

To

Shri. B. C. Banerjee
Secretary, Linguistic Provinces Commission,
Council-Hall, New Delhi,

Subject—Replies to Questionnaire.

Dear Sir,

In continuation of my letter of 28th August 1948, enclosing *in part* the replies to the Questionnaire of the L. P. Commission submitted by the Bri. Maha. Karyalaya, Sangli, I have the honour to enclose the full text of replies in print.

We have taken advantage of the longer time at our disposal to improve our former replies in certain respects. The improvement in no way alters the substance of the former replies. The present printed replies should however be understood to supersede the former ones, and should be treated as the final and definitive statement of the views of the Brihan-Maharashtriya Karyalaya.

Yours faithfully
V. N. Desai
Chairman.

Enclosures:—(1) Four Copies of printed replies of B.M.K. Sangli.
(2) One map.

APPENDIX (A)—xNUCLEAR MAHARASHTRA *administered by the Indian Union.

Serial No.	Table No.	Administrative Unit.	1941 Census figures.		1931 Census figures.		P. C. of Col. 7 to Col. 6
			Area Sq. Mile.	Population.	Population.	+ Marathi speakers.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	I	Bombay province. (11 Districts & Bombay City)	47,286	1,29,13,544	1,13,01,893	92,25,119	81.59
2	II	States merged in the Bombay Province.	4,601	8,85,018	7,96,226	6,93,103	87.16
Total of Bombay Maharashtra.			51,887	1,37,98,562	1,20,98,119	99,18,222	81.69
3	III	Mahavidarbha (4 Distracts of Berar and 4 of Marathi C, P.)	36,865	70,20,694	64,82,344	49,43,090	76.25
Total of I, II & III			88,752	2,08,19,256	1,85,08,463	1,48,61,322	80.32

x For explanation see foot note. on page No. 11

* " administered by the Indian Union " is used to indicate Provinces and merged States.

+ Here the term " Marathi " comprises Kokani, Khandeshi and Halabi dialects of Marathi.

APPENDIX (A), Table No. I

Table No. I—11 Districts and Bombay City in the Bombay Province.

S. No.	District.	1941 Census figures,		1931 Census figures.		
		Area Sq. Miles.	Population.	Population.	Marathi Speakers	Percentage to Col. 6 to Col. 5
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	Bombay City.	30	14,89,883	11,61,383	5,93,760	51.25
2	Suburban Dist.	153	2,51,147	1,79,524	1,15,481	64.24
3	Thana Dist.	3,526	9,32,733	8,36,625	7,29,642	87.20
4	Ahmednagar.	6,646	11,42,229	9,88,206	8,70,084	88.00
5	East Khandesh.	4,598	13,27,722	12,06,035	9,64,120	79.93
6	West Khandesh.	5,320	9,12,214	7,71,794	4,01,426	52.10
7	Nasik.	5,922	11,13,901	10,00,048	8,68,040	86.80
8	Poona.	5,347	13,59,408	11,69,798	10,37,075	83.70
9	Satara.	4,891	13,27,249	11,79,712	11,11,294	93.47
10	Sholapur.	4,572	10,14,670	8,77,520	8,85,187	78.10
11	Colaba.	2,212	6,68,922	6,28,721	5,99,623	95.22
12	Ratnagiri.	4,069	13,73,466	13,02,527	12,49,379	95.92
Total:—		47,286	1,2913,544	1,13,01,893	92,25,119	81.59

APPENDIX (A), Table No. II

9 States merged in the Bombay Province.

13	Jawhar.	308	65,126	57,261	55,985	97.72
14	Janjira.	326	1,03,557	98,206	84,874	86.35
15	Bhor.	910	1,55,961	1,41,546	1,39,252	98.58
16	Phaltan.	391	71,473	58,761	55,632	94.71
17	Sawantwadi.	937	2,52,050	2,30,589	2,25,487	93.47
	Dangs Dist.	1729	2,36,851	2,09,863	1,29,988	61.89
18	{ Bansa.	{ 212	{ 54,735	{ 48,839	{ 26,709	{ 53.38
19	{ Surgana.	{ 131	{ 18,292	{ 15,245	{ 15,073	{ 98.68
20	{ Dharampur.	{ 719	{ 1,23,326	{ 1,12,031	{ 71,171	{ 63.40
21	{ Dangs.	{ 667	{ 40,498	{ 33,748	{ 18,920	{ 56.06
	Total	4,601	8,85,018	7,96,226	6,93,103	87.16

APPENDIX (A), Table No. III
Maha-Vidarbha: 4 Districts of Berar & 4 of C. P.

S. No.	Districts.	1941 Census figures.		1931 Census figures.		
		Area Sq. Miles.	Population.	Population.	Marathi Speakers.	Percentage of Col. 6 to Col. 5
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22	Amaravati.	4,715	9,88,524	9,41,604	7,21,528	76.62
23	Akola.	4,093	9,07,742	8,76,362	7,07,549	82.30
24	Buldhana.	3,763	8,20,862	7,66,584	6,47,098	84.57
25	Yeotmal.	5,238	8,87,738	8,57,288	5,96,100	69.42
26	Wardha	2,435	5,19,330	5,16,266	4,00,131	77.51
27	Nagpur	3,836	10,59,989	9,40,049	7,12,533	75.74
28	Chanda	9,205	8,73,284	7,59,695	5,48,011	72.20
29	Bhandara	3,580	9,62,225	8,24,494	6,10,140	75.48
Total		36,865	70,20,694	64,82,344	49,43,090	76.25

APPENDIX—B

Border Areas Bilingual Administered by the Indian Union, to be partly* incorporated into the Linguistic Province of Maharashtra, according to their division by the Boundary Commission

Table No.	District or State.	1941 Census Figures.		1901 Census Figures.					
		Area	Population	Population	Marathi Speakers.	Kannada Speakers.	Hindi Speakers	Gondi Speakers	Lambadi Speakers.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
IV	Belgaum	2,536;	7,99,364	6,37,090	2,44,913	3,29,061
V	Karwar	2,848;	3,52,863	3,43,183	1,57,529	1,68,613
VI	Merged States	17,680	14,83,456	12,63,487	5,71,665	2,50,511	25,774	2,62,988
VII	Districts of C. P.	7,236;	11,26,456	10,95,114	3,31,884	4,98,589	1,42,600	23,422
Grand Total of Appendix-B		30,300;	37,62,139						

15,150; 18,81,069; { *Area and population to be incorporated into Maharashtra is presumed to be one-half of the totals of different border territories

APPENDIX (B), Table No. IV: Belgaum District.

S. No.	Taluka	1941 Census		1931 Census		
		Area	Population	Population	Marathi	Kannada
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30	Belgaum	470	1,58,229	1,05,528	48,956	38,554
31	Chandgad	175	40,451	32,034	30,378	951
32	Khanapur	633	70,940	81,902	48,643	26,609
33	Hukeri	343	1,44,189	1,18,149	18,232	89,677
34	Chikodi	489	2,21,451	1,68,400	78,813	92,547
35	Athani	446	1,64,104	1,13,077	19,991	80,723
Total:—		2,536	7,99,364	6,37,090	2,44,913	3,29,061

APPENDIX (B), Table V: Karwar District.

S. No.	Taluka	1941 Census		1931 Census		Kanned
		Area	Population	Population	Mazathi	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
36	Karwar	283	68,376	58,460	42,551	12,595
37	Halyal	323	28,204	35,122	19,501	10,258
38	Supa.	734	14,812	21,008	19,053	1,186
39	Yallapur	502	15,227	22,814	9,027	11,972
40	Ankola	355	42,213	39,665	11,460	27,043
41	Bhatkal	135	45,306	37,668	11,430	25,056
42	Honawar	291	66,980	62,406	24,621	36,048
43	Kumatha	225	71,745	66,040	19,886	44,185
Total:—		2,848	3,52,863	3,43,183	1,57,529	1,68,613

APPENDIX (B), Table VI: Merged States

Serial No.	state	1941 Census Figures		1931 Census Figures			
		Area	Population	Population	Marathi	Kanadi	Goudi
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
44	Aundh	488	88,723	76,507	65,466	6,547	
45	Kurundwad Sr.	200	52,552	44,204	21,775	17,732	
46	„ Jr.	126	46,609	37,583	18,496	15,959	
47	Miraj Sr.	368	1,08,547	93,938	56,411	34,442	
48	„ Jr.	194	46,295	40,684	21,338	16,270	
49	Sangli	1,146	2,93,381	2,58,442	1,36,173	98,752	
50	Wadi Jahagir	12	2,522	1,704	252	1,322	
51	Akalkot.	473	1,03,903	92,605	27,773	50,003	
52	Jath.	972	1,07,036	91,099	48,488	35,494	
52 a	Bastar	13,701	6,33,888	5,24,721	1,75,493	262,988
Total :—		17,680	14,83,456	12,63,487	5,71,665	250,511	262,988

APAENDIX (B), Table No. VII: Talukas in C. P. Districts.

Serial No.	District	Taluka	1941 Census Figures		1931 Census Figures				
			Area	Population	Population	Marathi	Hindi	Gondi	Karku
1.	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
53	Nimar	Burhanpur	1138	1,10,229	14,5,241	62,769	47,801
54	Betul	Bhaisdehi	1,340	1,04,435	93,554	20,301	20,049	29689	23,422
55	..	Multai	972	1,834,96	1,70,592	59,195	97,463	30348
56	Chhindwada,	Sausar	1,114	1,73,140	1,71,562	82,343	38,136	48021
57	..	Shiwani	1,756	2,48,512	2,51,304	18,379	1,66,876
58	Balaghat Wara	Shiwani	916	3,06,644	2,62,861	88,897	1,41,264	34,542
Total:—			7,236	11,26,456	10,95,114	3,31,884	493,589	1,42,600	23,422

APPENDIX—C

Nuclear Areas of Maharashtra outside the scope of this Inquiry,
not being Administered by the Indian Union.

Serial No.	Table No.	Areas	1941 Census Figures.			1931 Census Figures.		
			Area	Population	Marathi speakers.	Population	Marathi speakers.	Percentage of Col.6 to 5
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
8	VIII	Districts in Hyderabad State,	22,766	42,49,272	31,51,865	75.15
9	IX	Divisions of Portuguese India.	1,521	6,50,000*	6,40,000*	5,43,541*	5,38,000*	99.00
Total of App.—C.			24,287	48,99,272				
* These figures are approximate only.								

APPENDIX (C), TABLE No. VIII.

Nuclear Districts in the Hyderabad State.

S. No.	District	Figures from 1941 Census Reports.			
		Area in Sq. Miles.	Population	Marathi Speakers.	Percentage of Col. 5 to Col. 4
1	2	3	4	5	6
59	Aurangabad	6,212	10,71,050	7,70,281	71.61
60	Bid.	4,132	7,13,630	6,06,525	85.00
61	Nanded.	3,771	8,03,115	4,90,744	61.10
62	Perbhani.	5,125	9,11,886	7,20,478	79.00
63	Usmanabad.	8,526	7,48,691	5,63,837	75.31
	Total :-	22,766	42,46,272	31,51,865	74.15

APPENDIX (C), Table No. IX.

Nuclear areas under Portuguese Rule.

Figures from 1931 Census.					
S. No.	Taluka.	Area.	Population.	Marathi Speakers.	P. C.
64	Goa.	1,461	5,05,281	5,00,000 Approx.	99.00
65	Nagar Haveli (Daman)	60	38,260	38,000	99.00
Total :—		1,521	5,43,541	5,38,000	99.00

Appendix—D

Border Areas of Maharashtra outside the scope of this inquiry,
not being administered by the Indian Union.

S. No.	Table No.	State	1941 Census figures		1931 Census figures.		
			Area	Population	Population	Marathi	Kannada
10	X	Kolhapur	3,219	10,92,046	9,57,137	7,64,848	1,47,018

Assumed to be one half of the totals of the states.

S. No.	Table	Districts of Hyderabad	1941 Census Figures.							
			Area.	Population.	Marathi	Kannada	Telgu	Urdu	Gondi	Lambadi
11	XI	Adilabad	6,514	7,05,908	1,22,685	—	4,06,657	54,180	64,994	36,558
12	XII	Bidar	4,187	9,45,270	3,54,932	2,73,628	82,411	1,56,587
13	XIII	Gulbarga	2,451	4,05,773	92,075	70,008	1,55,622	70,824
Total:—			13,152	20,56,951	5,69,692	3,43,636	6,41,690	2,81,591	64,9943	6,558
Grand Total of Appendix—D.			16,371	31,48,997						

Presumed to be one-half of the totals of the border territories	}	8185,	1574448.
---	---	-------	----------

Appendix (D) Table No. X

Serial No.	State	1941 Census Figures		1931 Census Figures		
		Area	Population	Population	Marathi	Kannada
66	Kolhapur	3,219	10,92,046	9,57,137	7,64,848	1,47,018
	Total	3,219	10,92,046	9,57,137	7,64,848	1,47,018

APPENDIX (D) Table No. XI Adilabad District.

S. No. Taluka.		1941 Census.						
		Area.	Population.	Marathi.	Telugu	Urdu.	Gondi.	Lambadi.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
68	Kinwat.	812	81,715	15,281	34,207	6,600	7,470	15,904
69	Both.	575	70,241	9,920	37,310	5,051	8,715	9,088
70	Khorad.	—	4,645	729	3,204	772	—	—
71	Nirmal.	455	1,13,323	15,851	76,067	12,847	854	2,478
72	Utnur.	344	24,122	1,102	3,956	1,129	14,940	2,272
73	Rajura.	823	75,532	11,252	41,608	2,620	16,430	880
74	Asifagad.	803	75,272	22,591	34,689	4,549	9,960	626
75	Shirpur.	880	83,397	12,767	61,759	5,858	1,245	1,288
76	Adilabad.	940	93,250	20,400	50,907	8,898	4,980	2,376
77	Chinnur.	882	84,411	12,292	62,970	5,916	400	1,646
Total :—		6,514	7,05,908	1,22,685	406,657	54,180	64,994	36,558

APPENDIX (D), Table No, XII Bidar District.

Serial No.	Taluka.	1941 Census					
		Area	Population	Marathi	Kannda	Telgu	Urdu
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
78	Bidar.	607	1,34,212	1,274	41,957	48,048	40,315
79	Moinabad.	209	87,443	5,934	52,041	5,460	22,360
80	Ghorwadi.	250	43,980	9,179	25,016	2,184	6,708
81	Alikhed.	192	26,457	11,725	4,180	1,092	7,826
82	Udgir.	684	1,34,877	71,016	33,270	2,184	22,360
83	Deoni.	160	26,843	18,725	4,436	156	3,354
84	Janwada.	440	69,995	4,155	39,824	12,012	10,062
85	Bhalgi.	92	25,547	10,715	6,654	1,092	4,472
86	Nilanga.	651	1,14,006	86,483	8,872	3,092	13,416
87	Bori.	-	9,137	6,493	347	45	2,236
88	Pratappur.	222	60,054	18,458	26,616	6,352	7,826
89	Walandi	-	16,117	7,379	4,545	297	3,354
90	Ahmadpur.	680	1,46,802	1,03,396	25,870	297	12,298
Total :-		4,187	9,45,270	3,54,932	2,73,628	82,411	1,56,557

APPENDIX (E), Table XIII: Gulbarga District.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
91	Aland	402	53,019	15,875	23,632	364	12,142
92	Kalyani	272	47,798	15,420	15,610	3,625	11,173
93	Chincholi	823	90,802	31,950	157,798	20,625	14,925
94	Kodangal	622	1,24,404	3,113	1,610	1,01,657	11,018
95	Kosagi	-	19,396	9,268	1,126	5,443	3,547
96	Tandur	211	41,862	14,840	1,896	12,114	11,928
97	Bashirabad	121	27,952	1,609	10,345	8,794	6,091
Total :—		2,451	4,05,773	92,075	70,008	1,52,622	70,824

Appendix - E

Agreement between some leaders for creation of sub-provinces within linguistic Province of Maharashtra.

It is agreed that there shall be one province of United Maharashtra (Samyukta Maharashtra) with sub-provinces of the Marathi-speaking areas of Central Provinces & Berar, commonly styled Mahavidarbha, and West Maharashtra with separate legislatures and cabinets for the sub-provinces and with specified subjects under their jurisdiction. The province shall have the right to create other sub-provincial units whenever found necessary and feasible. There shall be one Governor and one Deputy Governor for the whole province elected by the whole province and a provincial cabinet and legislature dealing with the provincial subjects. The provincial legislature shall be composed of representatives of the people on the basis of population. The elections to the sub-provincial legislatures shall be held separately. Two High Courts shall function independently for the two sub-provinces except for a common tribunal set up for specific jurisdiction. There shall be a common public services commission for the whole province.

Prominent among signatories

- | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| (1) Shri ShankarRao Deo. | (2) Dr. D. R. Gadgil. |
| (3) Hon. H. E. M. S. Aney. | (4) Shri M. S. Kannamwar. |
| (5) Shri P. S. Deshamukh. | (6) Shri Ramarao Deshamukh. |
| (7) Shri Brijlal Biyani. | (8) Shri Pandharinath Patil. |

APPENDIX (F)

Special Arrangements for Scottish Affairs in the Government of United Kingdom

(The Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1939 Edi, Vol. 20, page 147)

The Minister for Scottish affairs who is the Secretary of State for Scotland, came into existence at the Union, but was abolished in 1746 and restored in 1885. In 1894 the Local Govt. Board for Scotland was established. In 1926 the Secretaryship for Scotland was raised to a Principal Secretaryship of State with a seat in the Cabinet. The Dept. of Scottish affairs is the Scottish Office. The Secretary for Scotland is the responsible head of the other Depts, by which Scottish business is administered and is assisted by the Lord Advocate and the Solicitor General for Scotland, both of whom are members of the Govt. though not in the Cabinet, and by the parliamentary and Permanent Under-Secretaries. The official publication of Scottish business is made in the Edinburgh Gazette. The other Scottish Depts. each with its Permanent Secretary and office in Edinburgh, are the Scottish Board of Health, which succeeded in 1919 to the former Local Govt. Board for Scotland; the General Board of Control; Scottish Education Dept.; the Board of Agriculture for Scotland and Fishery Board of Scotland. There is also a Scottish valuation office in Edinburgh under the administration of the Board of Inland Revenue for the U. K.

There are, however, no Scottish Depts. to answer for the functions and policy exercised by the Home Office, the Board, of Trade, and the Ministry for Transport, Labour and Pensions; and in respect of mines, immigration, electricity supply, roads, canals unemployment etc.

Appendix (G)

Area, population and revenue of (1) Linguistic Maharashtra and (2) Bombay Province.

Serial No.	Reference to previous table.	District or State	1941 census figures		1945-46 Revenue Accounts.
			Area Sqr. miles	Population	
1.		Linguistic Maharashtra Composed of	1,36,374	2,91,74,095	36,94,45,890
1 (a)		Proposed Province of Maharashtra (Districts and merged states administered by Indian Union)	1,03,902	2,27,00,325	30,67,50,390
	App. (A)	Comprising (1) Nuclear Maharashtra.	88,752	2,08,19,256	30,19,77,890
		Containing			
T. -- I & III	(a)	Districts in Provinces of Bombay and C. P. - Berar.	84,151	1,99,34,239	29,23,60,890
T. -- II	(b)	merged States.	4,601	8,85,018	96,17,300
App. (B)	(ii)	Border Areas.	15,150	18,81,069	47,72,500

T. - IV, V & VII.	(c) Talukas in Belgaum, Karwar and in C. P. Districts.	6,310	11,39,341	not available
T. - VI.	(d) Merged states,	8,840	7,41,728	47,72,500
1 (b)	Areas not administered by the Indian Union.	32,472	64,73,770	6,26,95,500
App. (C)	(iii) Nuclear Maharashtra	24,287	48,99,272	5,69,00,000
T.-VIII	(e) Districts in Hyderabad State.	22,766	42,49,272	5,28,00,000
	(f) Districts under Portuguese rule	1,521	6,50,000	41,00,000
App. (D)	(IV) Border areas	8,185	15,74,498	57,95,500
T.- X	(g) State	1,609	5,46,023	57,95,500
T.- XI to XIII	(h) Districts in Hyderabad State.	6,578	10,28,475	Not available
2	Present — day Bombay Province	76,443	2,08,49,840	34,96,87,000

* These figures are being assumed to be one-half of the totals, of area, population and revenue belonging to Maharashtra.

x Approximate figures.

Appendix E: Table No. XVI. Revenue of Nuclear Maharashtra.
Revenue Receipts for 1945-46 according to Provincial Budgets:

S. No.	Heads of Revenue.	Bombay City & Suburban Districts.	10 Districts of B. bay Province	Total of Columns 3 and 4	Berar 4 Districts.	Marathi C. P. 4 Districts.	Total of Cols. 6 & 7	Total of Columns 5 & 8
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Major Heads—		7,48,03,801	9,80,26,671	17,28,29,752	2,03,22,354	2,07,15,284	4,10,37,638	21,38,67,390
1	Land Rev.	11,09,506	2,07,09,048	2,18,18,554	98,51,462	34,82,642	1,33,34,104	3,51,52,658
2	Excise	2,55,91,553	3,64,60,917	6,20,52,470	46,52,683	70,99,759	1,17,52,442	7,38,04,912
3	Registration	5,09,803	11,30,839	16,40,642	2,45,344	4,64,050	7,09,394	23,50,036
4	Stamps.	1,44,50,537	59,30,506	2,03,81,043	15,23,863	20,46,303	35,70,166	2,39,51,209
5	Forest.	1,20,18,590	1,20,18,590	30,15,307	37,74,179	67,89,486	1,88,08,076
6	Local Fund.	34,422	28,40,842*	28,75,264	4,11,407	25,78,345	29,89,752	58,65,016
7	Motor Veh.	30,27,074	19,50,522	49,77,596	2,29,974	3,31,005	5,60,979	55,38,575
8	Other Taxes.	3,00,80,186	52,44,496	3,53,24,682	3,92,314	8,66,802	12,59,116	3,65,83,798
9	Irrigation	57,14,123	57,14,123	57,14,123
10	Water Tax	60,26,788	60,26,788	72,199	72,199	60,98,987
11	Minor Heads.		2,80,00,000	2,80,00,000		50,06,000	50,06,000	3,30,06,000
12	Portion of Income Tax returned by Central Govt.		3,83,00,000	3,83,08,000		71,87,500	71,87,500	4,54,87,500
Grand Total:—			23,91,29,752	23,91,29,752	5,32,31,138	5,32,31,138		29,23,60,890

APPENDIX G Tables Nos. XVII & XVIII

Revenue figures for the year 1945—46.

Nuclear Maharashtra		Border Maharashtra		
Table No. XVII.		Table No. XVIII.		
Merged States of Table No. II	Revenue	Merged States of Table No. VI	Revenue	Assumed as being one-half belonging to Maharashtra
Jawhar	10,00,000	Aundh	7,46,000	3,73,000
Janjira	15,00,000	Kurundwad Sr.	4,12,000	2,06,000
Bhor	9,58,000	Kurundwad Jr.	2,00,000	1,00,000
Phaltan	17,19,000	Miraj Sr.	9,80,000	4,90,000
Sawantawadi	10,12,000	Miraj Jr.	3,77,000	1,88,500
Bansda	7,50,000	Sangli	32,13,000	16,06,500
Surgana	1,90,000	Wadi	10,000	5,000
Dharampur	15,00,000	Akalkot	6,85,000	3,42,500
Dangs	9,88,000	Jath	4,11,000	2,05,500
		Baster	25,11,000	12,55,500
Total	96,17,000	Total,	95,45,000	47,72,500
		Table:	States not merged (App. D)	
		X Kolhapur	1,15,91,000	57,95,500
		Total,	2,11,36,000	1,05,68,000

Appendix (H) Table No. XIX

Mother Tongue statistics for Bombay City and suburban District; (From 1931 Bombay Census Reports.)

Serial No.	Mother tongue	Bombay City	Suburban District	Total of Col. 3 & 4	P. C. of language speaks to— Total population
1	2	3	4	5	6
1	All languages	11,61,383	1,79,524	13,40,907	
2	Total Marathi	5,93,740	1,15,481	7,09,241	52.92
	(a) Marathi	5,52,737	1,11,232	6,63,969	
	(b) Kokani	41,001	4,249	42,250	
	(c) Khandeshi	22	0	22	
3	Gujarati	2,42,443	23,795	2,66,238	19.86
4	Total Hindi *	2,08,323	24,794	2,33,117	17.39
Totals of 2, 3, 4.		10,44,526	1,64,070	12,08,576	90.17

Percentage of the Total Speakers of the minor languages comes to nearly 9.83.

* Hindi includes Western Hindi, Rajastani and Eastern Hindi.

Appendix (H), Table No. XX
Composition of population of the Bombay City according to its birthplace
as enumerated in 1931.

(Statement No. II, Page 15; 1931 Census of Bombay City)

Serial No.	Birth-place.	Out of 1000 population.	Serial No.	Birth-place	Out of 1000 population.
1	Bombay	246			
2	Places outside Bombay City	754			
3	Maharashtra including -	488	4	Gujarat	84
	(i) Suburban & Thana Districts	11	(viii) Surat	50	
	(ii) Ratnagiri District	204	(xi) Ahmedabad	18	
	(iii) Colaba District	28	(x) Other Gujarat	8	
	(iv) Central Division	142	Districts		
	(v) Kolhapur & S. M. C.	14	(xi) Baroda	5	
	(vi) U. P. & Berar	4	(xii) Cutch	3	
	(vii) Portuguese & French India	35	5	Hindi Speaking	82
				Provinces.	
			(xiii) U. P.	72	
			(xiv) Rajputana, Malwa	10	
			& Ajmer,		
			6	Rest of the Places	92

APPENDIX (H), Table No. XXI

Number of pupils in the Primary Schools conducted or aided by The Bombay Corporation.

Serial No.	Schools.	Number of pupils as on 1-1-1943.	P. C. of pupils in different Schools to total No. of pupils.	No. of pupils as on 1-8-48.	P. C. of pupils in different schools to the total No. of pupils.
1	Total of No. of pupils.	70,914		1,19,509	
2	Marathi	44,442	62.67	76,409	63.93
3	Gujarati	10,741	15.14	18,934	15.84
4	Urdu.	15,631	22.18	16,556	
	Hindi	4,687	
	Total of Urdu & Hindi	15,731	22.18	21,243	17.77
	Total of 2, 3, 4 & 5.	70,914	100 P. C.	1,16,586	97.54
Other minor Language Schools:—(Five in number) ; No. of pupils as on 1.8.48:—2,923 i.e. 2.44 P. C.					

Appendix—I

Shankar Ramchandra Shende-
Brihan Maharashtra Karyalaya,
Sangli (Maharashtra).
May 29th, 1948.

To

The Honourable Dr. Rajendra Prasad,
President of the Indian Constituent Assembly,
New Delhi.

Respected Doctorsaheb,

The newspapers have brought me the happy news that you are appointing a Commission to remodel the present provinces in India on the linguistic basis to suit the needs and circumstances of her peoples.

The Indian National Congress and the present popular Government have long ago pledged themselves to do so, and the people are awaiting fulfilment of that pledge. Therefore, they whole-heartedly welcome your move which is happily timed just when the Draft Constitution is to be shaped into its final form. This Constitution ought to set up the linguistic provinces so eagerly desired by the people.

I am approaching you with some suggestions on this point. They are as follows:—

1. The Government of India and the Constituent Assembly must be positive on the point that unless and until the linguistic provinces are constituted, brought into being, and set on their feet, the consideration of the Draft Constitution, especially the sections regarding provinces (pages 2 & 3), and Schedule I (pages 159-160) of the Draft Constitution should not be finalized.

If the contemplated Commission begins in right earnest, the creation of the linguistic provinces will hardly require 4 to 5

months, and the discussion on the sections concerned should be postponed until that stage, so as to include the finally constituted provinces in Schedule I.

2. India is physically divided into two parts, the Northern and Southern, and the provinces in these two divisions having been framed by the Britishers in a haphazard manner are dissimilar in nature. The provinces in the North individually contain people speaking one language. These are thus already linguistically homogeneous. But the territories of the three Indian Provinces, of a dozen ruling princes, and of two European powers in the South consist of peoples speaking more than one, even up to four languages each. This is the reason why the people in Southern India are keen on having linguistic provinces for themselves, while those in the north do not feel the necessity of favouring this demand.

3. This does not mean that the people in the North have no troubles of their own. The Bengal-Bihar-Orisa, and Bengal-Assam border troubles are well-known and these will have to be settled once for all by your commission, before delimiting the boundaries of these provinces.

4. Another point has cropped up in the North in connection with the newly constituted Unions of States that are being brought to the level of Indian Provinces. These Unions are mostly linguistically homogeneous, but they will have to be linguistically delimited in the border areas, on the same lines as those followed in the case of the Indian provinces.

5. The problem of reshuffling the provinces in Southern India is the main bone of the contention, and your Commission will have to exert earnestly at first to bring together under one Government all continuous areas of one language, scattered at present under different administrative units; and secondly to settle the linguistic boundaries on the border areas of these.

6. In Southern India there are 7 language areas, which deserve separate provinces for them. These are Gujarati, Chhatisagadi (Hindi C. P.), Marathi, Andhra (Telugu), Kannada, Tamil & Malayalam.

7. India has got a number of languages which are merely spoken ones. These do not possess even scripts of their own. The number speaking these is very limited. They are mostly illiterate and culturally backward and, therefore, have not reached the level of maintaining self-rule. This category of population will either have to be included in the neighbouring provinces or administered by the Central Government.

8. The contemplated Commission will have to lay down tests which will have to be satisfied by those language-speakers who demand a separate province for themselves. The following may be some of these:—

(a) The minimum number of population of a proposed province must be at least two crores. This rule must apply even to a proposal of dividing one language area into more provinces than one.

(b) The revenue of the proposed province must be sufficient to support a High Court, a University and a Police force adequate for maintaining Law & Order. Generally speaking a province must be in a position to keep up the modern standard of administration.

(c) The population must be culturally and educationally in a sufficiently advanced stage to handle their Government efficiently.

(d) They must be capable enough to utilize the natural resources to enhance their productive capacity and increase revenue.

9. You are aware that, when the resolution for creating linguistic provinces, moved by Mr. Pataskar, a member of the Indian Constituent Assembly, was to be discussed on 28th November 1947, about 29 amendments were tabled: some on behalf of the dialects and sub-dialects, and some on other grounds, for separate provinces for them. This vicious move ought to be noted as a warning to you and to your Commission for restricting such jealous and unwarranted demands by insisting upon minimum criteria:—

(a) No province should be allowed to create a sub-province or sub-provinces of whatever nature, inside it.

(b) There must be one legislature and one ministry for the entire province.

(c) No dialect should be given a separate province unless the number speaking it is at least two crores.

(d) Culturally and educationally they must stand the test and reach the requisite level.

(e) The proposed province must predominantly contain one language.

(f) There should be no province created based on caste, creed, or religion.

10. A linguistic province must not claim non-contiguous regions even though they may contain a majority speaking its (province's) language. It must necessarily be contiguous and must have speakers of that language in majority. This can be ascertained by the language figures from 1931 Census reports. In 1941 the tabulation of Census enumerations was not completed, and therefore no other course is left than to remain content with 1931 figures.

11. The proposed Commission should not only consider the cases of those who are demanding the linguistic provinces for themselves, but also take into account the question of linguistic areas which have not so far agitated for a separate province. It would be unjust and unfair to raise some linguistic areas to the status of a province and confer fe-ruslls on them, and leave the rest divided and scattered, as they are at present, and deny them the benefit of Self-Government.

12. The areas of the seven languages prevalent in Southern India are so intermixed in more than a dozen administrative units, as described above, as not to make it possible and practicable to create contiguous and linguistically homogeneous provinces without dislocating the territory of adjoining Governments. The only solution to this difficulty

is to abolish all the administrative units of all existing types in this peninsula, as they stand to day, and redistribute the whole of it on linguistic basis afresh.

13. In the formation of linguistic provinces the territories of the princes were stumbling blocks, and hard nuts to crack. The Britishers while leaving India had made them still harder by extending to Princes sovereignty over their territories. But the strong, prompt, and tactful action by the Honourable Sardar Patel has brought them all except one i. e. Hyderabad State, under Central control. Most of these have become or are going to become in due course of time part and parcel of the Indian Union. The only hard rock to be blasted is that of the Hyderabad State. It is to be seen whether the state-subjects, or the Indian Union, or both jointly are going to bring the Nizam into line with others. This State consists of the three linguistic areas of Maharashtra, Andhra & Karnatak. These three linguistic provinces will not be solid and complete unless and until the Hyderabad State is partitioned among them.

14. Another issue that confronts us is the division of the border areas of two adjacent provinces into separate linguistic regions. These borders or bilingual areas are villages lying between two language-territories. These will have to be included in either of them. There are no official records existing to determine these. The Census records do not provide the material to meet the need. The only way left is either to take a fresh Census or hold plebiscite. The border-regions are mostly villages. The residents of these are mostly illiterate and ignorant about the issues involved and therefore the plebiscite will not yield the desired result. There is every chance of these villagers being misled by the propagandists. The best course therefore will be to take a census, and take into account the history and culture of the people to determine their political unit.

15. There are seven such border areas in Southern India. These are:—(a) Marathi-Hindi from Balaghat to Buhranpur, (b) Marathi-Gujerati between Navsari and Dharampur, (c) Marathi-Kannada between Akkalkot and Karwar, (d) Andhra-Tamil

and Kannada between Madras & Bellary, (e) Kannada-Tamil talukas south of the Mysore State, (f) Tamil-Malayalam tract between Madras districts and Travancore and Cochin States, (g) Marathi, Kannada, Malayalam & Tulu languages prevalent in the South Kanara District will prove a problem to your Commission.

16. The following suggestion is being made to you as the President of the Indian National Congress. You are aware that there are more than one Provincial Congress Committee in one and the same linguistic area. It was rightly felt necessary to create these 28 years ago, corresponding to the linguistic units in the provinces and the States to create and agitate mass force while struggling for freedom. Now the battle with the Britishers is over, and we are a free and Independent Nation out to remove the unnatural combinations of language-speakers by creating linguistically homogeneous Provincial Governments. Therefore there is now no need left for more than one P. C. C. in one language area. I, therefore, request you as the head of the Congress organization to abolish these or to make them merge into one Provincial Congress Committee for each linguistic unit. That there has arisen an unhealthy rivalry and separatist mentality amongst the sister P. C. C. s existing in one language area was exhibited when 29 amendments came forward to Mr. Pataskar's resolution. Amalgamation of these P. C. C. s will prepare ground for creating harmony and unity among people speaking one language with one Government for them all.

17. It is essential to obtain sanction from the P. C. C. s for the redistribution of the existing provinces and states into contiguous and homogeneous linguistic provinces; one for each linguistic area.

I am
Sincerely Yours,
Shan. Ra. Shende.

Explanatory Notes to Map No. 4 of Linguistic Maharashtra.

I Nuclear areas (of Linguistic Maharashtra) are whole districts in Provinces or in States predominantly inhabited through out their extent by Marathi speaking population.

II Border Areas (of Linguistic Maharashtra) are bilingual or multi-lingual talukas bordering Nuclear Areas. Such talukas will have to be distributed among neighbouring linguistic units in appropriate village groups, according to language Census.

III " Administered by the Indian Union " is used to mean Provinces of the Union or merged States - as distinguished from territories belonging to and administered by acceding States or Unions of States, or to non-acceding States or a Foreign Power.

IV There is strong case for investigating the Linguistic complexion of the three areas with a view to their amalgamation in Linguistic Maharashtra.

These are :—(1) Barwani and adjacent Central India States, (2) The Dangs territory of the Baroda State and (3) South Canara District of the Madras Province, have been shown as parts of the Linguistic Maharashtra in the Map. Portion of these areas contain majority of Marathi speakers contiguous to the Nuclear Maharashtra. We did not mention these in the Language-tables appended to the reply to your Question No. 2, as we do not possess exact information of the people and of the areas they cover.

Still we give below whatever material we could procure mostly from official sources to invite your attention as well as that of the impending Boundary Commission which will have to conduct inquiries in these parts and see which parts deserve inclusion in the proposed province of Maharashtra.

- (1) Some villages belonging to Barwani and adjacent Central India States contain majority of the Marathi Speakers. Such villages are contiguous to Shabada and Shirpur Talukas of the West Khandesh District.
- (2) Kokani a dialect of Marathi predominantly prevailing in the Danga districts has been registered in the southern area of the Navasari District of the Baroda State. They

number more than 10,000 and spread over an area covering many villages.

(3) The case of the Marathi speakers in the South Canara District is very strong. It is as ;—

(a) The Speakers of Marathi including Kokani in 1881 were 1,47,390 while in 1931 they were 2,41,890 i. e. 63% increase in 50 years.

(b) The speakers of Marathi-Kokani in 1931 were about 1,00,000 more than those in the North Canara District.

(c) The linguistic distribution of this district in 1931 was as:—

Speakers of Tulu: 5, 61, 633 i.e. 41% of the Population
 „ „ Malyali: 2, 98, 743 i.e. 21% „ „ „
 „ „ Kannada: 2,44, 552 i.e. 17.8% „ „ „
 „ „ Marathi: 2,41, 890 i.e. 17.6% „ „ „

(d) The position of these languages per 10,000 of population was:—

Year	Kannada	Tulu	Malyali.
1911	1,871	4,281	1 983
1931	1,782	4,928	2,177

These figures reveal that Kannada is decreasing while Tulu, Malyali and Marathi are increasing.

(e) Marathi is officially recognised as a regional language.

(f) There are recorded 21 dialects of Marathi in 1901 Census Report.

(g) The description of 17 Maharashtra castes has been given in 1901 Census Reports.

(h) Kokani in Mangalore Taluka and Marathi in Kasargod Taluka are prevalent in majority while both the dialects are equally strong in Udipi Taluka.

(i) 31 books were printed in Marathi between 1891 to 1900.

2. The ancient history of our Continent tells us that administrative divisions whenever devised were the territories colonized by the Vaidika Aryas and therefore these administrative units came out automatically composed of homogeneous societies.

3. It is the Britishers who when unexpectedly became successful in usurping the administration of the territories one after another in quick succession from the hands of the local powers and set-up the present day heterogeneous provinces of those regions. As a result a province of today is a bundle of different cultures histories, and languages. After a century the Britishers themselves found this sort of grouping of peoples of different characters unmethodical and had in mind to reshuffle the provinces systematically but the internal political and external international troubles did not allow them to materialize this proposal.

4. The leaders of today of our country have felt a great handicap to manage their movements in these provinces of mixed peoples and therefore have set up their own units according to the natural groups of peoples in the form of Provincial Congress Committees. The P. C. C.s were based on linguistic basis. The succes of the Congress movement to liberate our motherland from the clutches of the Britishers was solely due to setting up of the P. C. C.s on cultural footing. These P. C. C.s, in each linguistic area, are to be new autonomous administrative units as Linguistic Provinces in the new constitution that is being framed, now-a-days.

(Shri Siddheshwar Printing Press, Kolhapur)
