

THOUGHTS ON LINGUISTIC STATES

First published: 1955
Reprinted from the edition of 1955

Contents

PREFACE

PART I - The work of the commission

Chapter I : Linguism and nothing else

Chapter 2 : Linguism in excelsis

PART II - THE LIMITATIONS OF LINGUISM

Chapter III : The pros and cons of a linguistic state

Chapter IV : Must there be one state for one language ?

Chapter V : The north versus the south

PART III - SOLUTION

Chapter VI : The division of the north

Chapter VII : The problems of Maharashtra

Chapter VIII : Summary of principles covering the issue

PART IV - THE PROBLEMS OF LINGUISTIC STATES

Chapter IX : Viability

Chapter X : Majorities and minorities

PART V - THE NEED FOR A SECOND CAPITAL

Chapter XI : India and the necessity of a second capital a way to remove tension between the north and the south

PART VI - MAPS

PART VII - STATISTICAL APPENDICES

Appendix I : Population by Linguistic Families

Appendix II : Area and Population of States of United States of America

Appendix III : The population of the Bombay City according to the Communities

Appendix IV : Provincial/State Revenue

Appendix V : Budgetary Position of the States on Revenue Account

Appendix VI : Budgetary Position of the States on Revenue Account

Appendix VII : Central Revenues (Selected Years)

Appendix VIII : Population of the Indian Union by Communities

Appendix IX : Statistics of Chief Castes

Appendix X : Relative Population of Different Communities

THOUGHTS ON LINGUISTIC STATES

PREFACE

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

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

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

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

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

23rd December 1955
Milind Mahavidyalaya
Nagsen Vana, College Road
Aurangabad (Dn.)

B. R. AMBEDKAR

**THE WORK OF THE COMMISSION
CHAPTER I**

LINGUISTIC AND NOTHING ELSE

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

Part "A" States	Part "B" States	Part "C" States
1. 1. Andhra	1. 1. Hyderabad	1. 1. Ajmer
2. 2. Assam	2. 2. Jammu & Kashmir	2. 2. Bhopal
3. 3. Bihar	3. 3. Madhya Bharat	3. 3. Coorg
4. 4. Bombay	4. 4. Mysore	4. 4. Delhi
5. 5. Madhya Pradesh	5. 5. Patiala	5. 5. Himachal Pradesh
6. 6. Madras	6. 6. Rajasthan	6. 6. Kutch
7. 7. Orissa	7. 7. Saurashtra	7. 7. Manipur
8. 8. Punjab	8. 8. Travancore – Cochin	8. 8. Tripura
9. 9. Uttar Pradesh		9. 9. Vindhya Pradesh

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

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

Proposed New States

Name of the State	Area (Sq. Miles)	Population (Crores)	Language
Madras	50,170	3.00	Tamil
Kerala	14,980	1.36	Malyalam
Karnatak	72,730	1.90	Kanarese
Hyderabad	45,300	1.13	Telugu
Andhra	64,950	2.09	Telugu
Bombay	151,360	4.02	Mixed
Vidarbha	36,880	0.76	Marathi

Madhya Pradesh	171,200	2.61	Hindi
Rajasthan	132,300	1.60	Rajasthani
Punjab	58,140	1.72	Punjabi
Uttar Pradesh	113,410	6.32	Hindi
Bihar	66,520	3.82	Hindi
West Bengal	34,590	2.65	Bengali
Assam	89,040	0.97	Assamese
Orissa	60,140	1.46	Oria
Jammu and Kashmir	92,780	0.14	Kashmiri

The important thing is to compare the size of the states -

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

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

There are 4 states with a population between 2 and 4 crores each.

There is one state above 4 crores.

There is one state above 6 crores.

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

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

Chapter 2 LINGUISTIC EXCELLENCE

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

But there is another fault in the recommendation of the commission which perhaps is hidden but which is nonetheless real.

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

Southern States		Central States		Northern States	
Name	Population (in crores)	Name	Population (in crores)	Name	Population (in crores)
Madras	3.00	Maharashtra	3.31	Uttar Pradesh	6.32
Kerala	1.36	Gujarat	1.13	Bihar	3.85
Karnataka	1.90	Saurashtra	0.4	Madhya Pradesh	

Commented [f.1]: I have included certain centrally situated States because by language they are affiliated to one another.

Andhra	1.09	Kutch	0.5	Rajasthan	2.61
Hyderabad	1.13			Punjab	1.72

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

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

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

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

Part II

THOUGHTS ON LINGUISTIC STATES

PART II

THE LIMITATIONS OF LINGUISTICISM

CHAPTER III

THE PROS AND CONS OF A LINGUISTIC STATE

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

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

The reasons why a unilingual State is stable and a multi-lingual State unstable are quite obvious. A State is built on fellow feeling. What is this fellow-feeling ? To state briefly it is a feeling of a corporate sentiment of oneness which makes those who are charged with it feel that they are kith and kin. This feeling is a double-edged feeling. It is at once a feeling of fellowship for ones own kith and kin and anti-fellowship for those who are not one's own kith and kin. It is a feeling of " consciousness of kind " which on the one hand, binds together those who have it so strongly that it over-rides all differences arising out of economic conflicts or social gradations and, on the other, severs them from those who are not of their kind. It is a longing not to belong to any other group.

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

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

One reason is that democracy cannot work without friction unless there is fellow-feeling among

those who constitute the State. Faction fights for leadership and discrimination in administration are factors ever present in a mixed State and are incompatible with democracy.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Any Indian who does not accept this proposal as part and parcel of a linguistic State has no right to be an Indian. He may be a hundred per cent Maharashtrian, a hundred per cent Tamil or a hundred per cent Gujarathi, but he cannot be an Indian in the real sense of the word except in a geographical sense. If my suggestion is not accepted India will then cease to be India. It will be a collection of different nationalities engaged in rivalries and wars against one another.

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

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

This will be a death knell to the idea of a United India. With regional languages as official languages the ideal to make India one United country and to make Indians, Indians first and Indians last, will

vanish. I can do no more than to suggest a way out. It is for Indians to consider it.

CHAPTER IV

MUST THERE BE ONE STATE FOR ONE LANGUAGE ?

What does a linguistic State mean ?

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

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

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

How dangerous this disparity is, the Commission has not realised. Such disparity no doubt exists in the United States. But the mischief it might cause has been prevented by the provisions in the Constitution of the United States.

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

I give below the following extract from his minute

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

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

" In the Soviet Union also, in which great Russia has a larger population than most other units of

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

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

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

CHAPTER V

THE NORTH VERSUS THE SOUTH

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

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

Can the South tolerate the dominance of the North?

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

personal knowledge. As Chairman of the Drafting Committee I had naturally entry to the Congress Party enclosure.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

" If it is impossible to put the States Reorganisation Schemes in cold storage for the next 15 years,

the only alternative is for the Centre to govern India as a unitary state and deal with district officers and district boards directly, with regional commissioners' supervision.

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

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

Mr. Rajagopalachari has not expressed himself fully. He did do so fully and openly to me when he was the Head of the State and I was the Law Minister in charge of drafting the constitution. I went to Mr. Rajagopalachari for my usual interview which was the practice of the day. At one such interview Mr. Rajagopalachari, referring to the sort of constitution which the Constituent Assembly was making, said to me, "You are committing a great mistake. One federation for the whole of India with equal representation for all areas will not work. In such a federation the Prime Minister and President of India will always be from the Hindi speaking area. You should have two Federations, one Federation of the North and one Federation of the South and a Confederation of the North and the South with three subjects for the Confederation to legislate upon and equal representation for both the federations."

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

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

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

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

[Part III](#)

THOUGHTS ON LINGUISTIC STATES

PART III

SOLUTION

CHAPTER VI

THE DIVISION OF THE NORTH

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

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

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

Division of the Northern States

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

It is therefore necessary that this situation must be rectified. The only way to do this is to divide the three States of (1) Uttar Pradesh, (2) Bihar and (3) Madhya Pradesh into smaller units. In this behalf I make bold to offer certain tentative proposals.

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

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

Division of Uttar Pradesh.—My proposal with regard to the Uttar Pradesh is to divide it into three States (See Map 2). Each of these three States should have a population of approximately two crores which should be regarded as the standard size of population for a State to administer effectively.

Where the boundary lines of these three States should be drawn I have shown in the accompanying Map No. 2.

The three States of the Uttar Pradesh could have as their capitals

(2) Meerut (2) Cawnpore and (3) Allahabad. They are situated quite in the centre of each of these three States.

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

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

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

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

The old Madhya Pradesh consisted of :

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

This old State of Madhya Pradesh had a population of 2 1/2 crores. It consisted of 22 districts. Its legislature had 223 members.

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

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

The total population of this new Madhya Pradesh will be 26.1 million and its area will be about 171,200 square miles.

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

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

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

The State of Southern Madhya Pradesh should consist of—

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

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

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

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

CHAPTER VII

THE PROBLEMS OF MAHARASHTRA

I

THE PROPOSALS TO DEAL WITH MAHARASHTRA

Maharashtra is another area which is a subject of controversy. There are four proposals in the field :

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

I would like to state what my proposals are. They are as follows : Bombay as a mixed State should be done away with. I would divide Maharashtra into four States (See Map 5) : (1) Maharashtra City State (Bombay), (2) Western Maharashtra, (3) Central Maharashtra and (4) Eastern Maharashtra.

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

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

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

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

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

II

MAHARASHTRIANS UNDER THE MIXED STATE

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

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

Let us consider the distribution of Ministership :

Gujarathi Ministers	4
Marathi Ministers	4
Kannada Ministers	1
Total	9

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

Let us come to Deputy Ministers :

Marathi speaking	5
Gujarathi speaking	2
Kannada speaking	2
Total ...	9

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

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

Allocation of Subjects among Ministers

	Gujarathi Ministers			Maharashtrian Ministers		
1	Morarji Desai	105	subs	Hirey	49	subs
2	Dinkerrao Desai	26	subs	Nimbalkar	20	subs
3	Jivaraj Mehta	43	subs	Tapase	15	subs
4	Shantilal Shah	28	subs	Chavan	4	subs

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

Allocation of Subjects among Deputy Ministers

Allocation of Subjects among Ministers

	Gujarathi Deputy Ministers			Maharashtrian Deputy Ministers		
1	Indumati Sheth	12	subs	Wandrekar	12	subs
2	Babubhai J Patel	3	subs	Deshmukh	4	subs
				Naravane	5	subs
				Sathe	5	subs
				Faki	3	subs

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

Per Capita Expenditure on Development in Rupees		
		Years

	Population	1950-51	1951-52	1952-53
Maharashtra	21720091	1.7	2.3	1.8
Gujarath	11896789	2.9	3.1	3.2

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

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

III

THE POSITION OF THE CITY OF BOMBAY

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

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

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

The Gujarathis are happy. The Maharashtrians are naturally angry. The resentment of the Maharashtrians is well justified. The arguments urged against the claim of the Maharashtrians have no force at all.

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

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

The total Marathi population of Bombay City is no doubt less than 50 per cent. but it has to be valued against two factors. One is that geographically no one can deny that Bombay is part of

Maharashtra even if the Maharashtrians are in a minority in the City. Even Mr. Morarji Desai admitted in the course of his speech in the meeting of the Gujarath Pradesh Congress Committee that Bombay is part of Maharashtra.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

It is said that Bombay has been built up by the capital belonging to non-Maharashtrians. That may be so. But has Madras been built by the capital of Madrasees ? Has Calcutta been built by the capital of Bengalees ? Without the capital of Europeans Madras and Calcutta would have been villages. Then

why urge this point against the Maharashtrians when they claim Bombay to themselves ? Maharashtrians have at least contributed labour without which Bombay could not have been what it is. It must always be remembered that the life lines of Bombay lie in Maharashtra. The sources of its electricity lie in Maharashtra. Sources of its water supply lie in Maharashtra. The sources of its labour lie in Maharashtra. Maharashtra can at any time make the city of Bombay ' *Mohenjodaro* ' a City of the Dead.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There is also another reason why Bombay City should be made a separate state. The minorities and the Scheduled Castes who are living in the village are constantly subjected to tyranny, oppression, and even murders by the members of the majority communities. The minorities need an asylum, a place of refuge where they can be free from the tyranny of the majority. If there was a United Maharashtra with Bombay included in it where they can go to for safety ? The same tyranny was practised over the Brahmins, Marwaris and Gujarathis living in the villages when Godse killed Mr. Gandhi. All the Brahmins, Marwaris and Gujarathis who were once living in villages ran away and are now living in towns and forgetting their experiences are shouting for United Maharashtra, after having reached a safe harbour.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

With regard to the Electricity Tax the situation is different.

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

To put it in concrete shape let the Centre take over the taxation of Electricity and divide the yield among the four States of Maharashtra— (1) Bombay, (2) Western Maharashtra, (3) Central Maharashtra, (4) Eastern Maharashtra according to their needs. It will also ease the financial strain that the three Maharashtras are likely to suffer on account of the separation of Bombay.

IV UNITED OR DIVIDED ?

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

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

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

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

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

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

For the present, from the point of view of area and population there is nothing to complain against the three divisions.

From the earliest times they have always been spoken of as *Trai Maharashtra*.

The division does no wrong to the language principle. In fact if all the three Maharashtras have the same language it can help to develop the Marathi language if it is worth their while to do so.

The question of viability I will consider later on. I propose to deal with it separately in a special chapter.

Bombay was then unknown. Otherwise it would have been the fourth part of Maharashtra.

Of the remaining three parts what I call Eastern Maharashtra is already a separate State. All that required is that it should be allowed to remain separate. It has got a well-established administration system, a well-established revenue system and a well-established judicial system. It has been separated from the trammels of the Hindi-speaking people.

The only problem that remains is how to divide the area covered by the Maharashtra which is part of the present Bombay State and the Marathwada of the Hyderabad State.

Instead of forming a merger of the two into one and joining it to the third which I call Eastern Maharashtra, why not divide the Maharashtra part of Bombay and Marathwada into two equal States ? This is my scheme. I transfer six districts of Maharashtra part of the Bombay State and make them part of Marathwada. (See Map No. 5). The distribution of the area and population of the three Maharashtras are shown below :

The Population Area and Revenue of the Three Maharashtra States will be approximately as follows:

Name of State	Total Population of the territory	Area in square miles	Total Revenue	Total expenditure
Western Maharashtra	12677316	30028	262420441	not known
Central Maharashtra	12409044	55482	216380095	not known
Eastern Maharashtra	8027130	39004	94111012	not known
Total	33113490	124514	572911548	not known

I will now proceed to state my reasons in support of my plan.

I have said that Maharashtra has always been divided into three. This is a historical argument. It at least shows that the tradition, the way of life and the social and economic condition of what is called United Maharashtra is not one. Those who are in a hurry to have United Maharashtra may not take it seriously. But there are other arguments which arise out of the present condition and which cannot be ignored. I mention a few.

My first argument is that a single Government cannot administer such a huge State as United

Maharashtra.

The total population of the Marathi-speaking area is 3,30,83,490. The total area occupied by the Marathi-speaking people is 1,74,514 sq. miles. It is a vast area and it is impossible to have efficient administration by a single State. Maharashtrians who talk about Samyukta Maharashtra have no conception of the vastness as to the area and population of their Maharashtra. But why there should be one single Maharashtrian State. I am quite unable to understand. To have a separate Maharashtra State is one thing. To have a single Maharashtra State is quite a different thing. I am in favour of a separate Maharashtra, separate from Gujarathis and separate from Hindi-speaking people. But I am unable to understand why a free Maharashtra should be made into one single State. The Maharashtrians are not planning to declare war on U.P. and therefore they need not have a common front.

Even from the point of view of Marathas why should there be this consolidation? What affiliation has a Maratha of Satara got with the Maratha of Aurangabad? What affiliation has a Maratha of Nasik got with the Maratha of Ratnagiri? What care and interest a Maratha of Satara is going to bestow upon the problems of the Maratha of Aurangabad? What care and interest a Maratha of Nasik is going to bestow upon the problems of the Maratha of Ratnagiri? The consolidation has no meaning and can serve no purpose.

All Maratha Ministers in the present Bombay Cabinet come from Satara District or Nasik District. There is none from Konkan.

The second consideration is the economic inequality between the three parts of Maharashtra. Marathwada has been solely neglected by the Nizam. What guarantee is there that the other two Maharashtras will look after the interests of what I call the Central Maharashtra?

The third consideration is industrial inequality between the three parts of Maharashtra. Western Maharashtra and Eastern Maharashtra are industrially well developed. What about the Central Maharashtra? What guarantee is there of its industrial development? Will Western Maharashtra and Eastern Maharashtra take interest in the industrial development of Central Maharashtra?

The fourth consideration is the inequality of education between Eastern and Western Maharashtra on the one hand and Central Maharashtra on the other. The inequality between them is marked. If the Central Maharashtra goes under the Poona University its destiny is doomed.

I am greatly worried about Marathwada. It was hitherto part of the Nizam's Territory for the last 200 years. The Nizam had criminally neglected this area. He took no interest in it. There is not a mile of canal irrigation in Marathwada. There is hardly a high school in taluka places in Marathwada. There is hardly a youth in Nizam's public service from Marathwada. I speak from knowledge and experience. People are not only down and out they are ignorant. They are being grabbed by highly advanced people on both sides. When their avenues of employment are closed there will be further degradation in their position.

I shudder to think what would happen when Marathwada goes under the Poona University. The standard of education in the schools and colleges under the Poona University is so high that hardly any boy from Marathwada can hope to pass the examination. It is quite possible that, with the madness for united Maharashtra there will develop a madness for a single and common University.

The creation of United Maharashtra will be followed by the onrush of Poona and Nagpur Brahmins in Marathwada to pick up the jobs.

There is a further reason why Maharashtra should be divided into three.

The total strength of the Bombay Legislative Assembly is 315, Out of them 149 members are Marathi-speaking. The total strength of the Bombay Legislative Council is 72; out of them 34 are Marathi-speaking. Obviously some Marathi-speaking person should have been the Chief Minister of the Bombay State. Mr. Hirey stood up as a candidate for the Chief Ministership, But he was made to sit down by the Congress High Command. Not only was Mr. Hirey made to sit down but he was forced to move that Mr. Morarji Desai be made the Chief Minister. What a humiliation for a Maharashtrian leader ! And what value does the Congress High command attach to the political intelligence of Maharashtrians ?

The same incapacity of the Maratha Ministers is clear from the division of subjects referred earlier.

It is obvious from the facts given above that the Marathas are lacking in political talent. There is no man of eminence among them such as Tilak, or Gokhale or Ranade. The Maharashtrian today counts for nothing. The Congress Maharashtrian counts for much less in the Congress. The non-Congress Maharashtrian also counts for nothing. It is therefore absolutely essential to train up Maharashtrians in political life. This political training has become fundamental because of the transfer of power to the masses. The word Marathas is used in two senses. In one sense it means all those who speak the Marathi language. In another sense it means all those who are Marathas by caste. They are all spoken of as Marathas. But they all fail to make the distinction between Marathas i.e. those who speak the Marathi language and Marathas i.e. those who are Marathas by caste.

Those who are going to rule Maharashtra are not Marathas by speech but Marathas by caste, notwithstanding the hopes of the Brahmins. Now it cannot be denied that Marathas are politically the most backward community. It is fundamental that they should receive political training. If there is only one Maharashtra only *one* Maratha can be trained as Chief Minister and five or six as Ministers. On the other hand if there are three Maharashtra States, three Marathas can find training as Chief Ministers and thirty Marathas can get training as Ministers. We can do real service to ourselves by helping to educate our Masters.

The only way of educating the Marathas is to give them more field for developing their abilities and exercising their abilities. Only the creation of three Maharashtra States can do this.

There is a story which is very appropriate to the occasion. The father of a young girl had taken her

for an outing in a jungle. She found that under big trees there stood small shrubs. Finding this to be uniformly so, she asked her father why these small shrubs under the big trees do not grow. The father not being a botanist could not give an answer. So he said : Oh ! I do not know. He, however, felt that the question was very significant. He was a Professor in a college. Next day he went to the college and put the question to his Botanist colleague. The Botanist replied: Why! The answer is simple. The big trees use up all the sun's rays to themselves. The shrubs do not get any rays. That is why they do not grow. The Marathwada people must not forget the moral of this story.

The only argument in favour of United Maharashtra is that it is like a meeting of the two brothers Rama and Bharat in Ramayana after a long separation. It is a silly argument, not worth consideration.

There are some Maharashtrians who are satisfied with some kind of Political Treaty with Western Maharashtra guaranteeing some concessions. Treaties are like scraps of paper. They cannot be enforced. Instead of political treaties which nobody can enforce is it not better to have power in one's own hands ?

What a poor and wretched show by Maharashtrians in the Government of Bombay ! If this is the show that the most advanced and educated part of Maharashtrians can make, what can be expected from the people of Marathwada?

I advise the people of Marathwada or Central Maharashtra to have a State of their own so that they have power in their own hands to improve their own lot.

RECLAMATION OF LOST TERRITORY

Should all the Marathi-speaking people be huddled up under one State ? Or should they be divided into two or more States.

How to dispose of the remainder when Bombay is separated is the next question. The remainder consists of two parts: (1) Gujarath, (2) Maharashtra.

I am concerned with Maharashtra.

While creating Linguistic Provinces the Commission has given over Marathi-speaking areas to non-Marathi-speaking areas. The number of such excluded areas are as follows :

1. Belgaum Taluka with the City of Belgaum.
2. Khanapur Taluka.
3. Chikori Taluka including Nipani.
4. Supa Taluka.

5. Karwar Taluka.
6. Nilanga Taluka in Bidar.
7. Ahamadpur Taluka in Bidar.
8. Udgir Taluka in Bidar.
9. Rajgir Taluka in Adilabad.
10. Some portion from Vidarbha given to the neighbouring Hindi-speaking State.

The Maharashtrians excluded from Maharashtra come to 13,89,648 in terms of population.

The Commission in retaining the mixed State of Bombay had to secure two most important objects. One is not to allow Bombay to go into the hands of Maharashtrians. This the Commission did by creating a mixed State. The second thing they had to do was to secure equality between Maharashtrians and the Gujarathis. The necessity of equality between the two In the future Legislature of the Bombay State as planned by the Commission had become urgent as the members of Karnatak in the old Assembly on whom the Gujarathis depended for their majority *were* to disappear in the new Karnatak State. This the Commission did by clipping the wings of Maharashtra by handing over Marathi-speaking people to non-Marathi-speaking States. There seems to be no other reason for this political vandalism.

This wrong done by the Commission to Maharashtra must now be remedied and fortunately it can be undone. The proposal of a mixed State is gone and there is no necessity for equality between Maharashtrians and Gujarathis.

CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY OF PRICIPLES COVERING THE ISSUE

For the sake of the reader I summarise below the principles which should underly the creation of Linguistic States which are already enunciated In

the foregoing pages but which lie about scattered. These principles may be staled as below :

- (1) The idea of having a mixed State must be completely abandoned.
- (2) Every State must be an unilingual State. One State, one language.
- (3) The formula one State, one language must not be confused with the formula of one language, one State.

- (4) The formula one language, one State means that all people speaking one language should be brought under one Government irrespective of area, population and dissimilarity of conditions among the people speaking the language. This is the idea that underlies the agitation for a united Maharashtra with Bombay. This is an absurd formula and has no precedent for it. It must be abandoned. A people speaking one language may be cut up into many States as is done in other parts of the world.
- (5) Into how many States a people speaking one language should be cut up, should depend upon (1) the requirements of efficient administration, (2) the needs of the different areas, (3) the sentiments of the different areas, and (4) the proportion between the majority and minority.
- (6) As the area of the State increases the proportion of the minority to the majority decreases and the position of the minority becomes precarious and the opportunities for the majority to practise tyranny over the minority become greater. The States must therefore be small.
- (7) The minorities must be given protection to prevent the tyranny of the majority. To do this the Constitution must be amended and provisions must be made for a system on plural member constituencies (two or three) with cumulative voting.

[Part IV](#)

THOUGHTS ON LINGUISTIC STATES

PART IV

THE PROBLEMS OF LINGUISTIC STATES

CHAPERT IX

VIABILITY

Will the three Maharashtrian States be viable ? Will their Revenue be sufficient to meet their expenditure ? Such a question is bound to be asked.

It is not that such a question can be asked about Maharashtra alone. It can be asked about many other States in India.

I give four statements relating to Part A States, Part B States and the Central Government from Part III of the Report of the Taxation Inquiry Committee presided over by Dr. John Mathai (See Tables 4, 5, 6 and 7).

From these statements the following propositions stand out:

- (1) That up to a certain year in the life of the States there was no deficit. They were all viable. It is only after Congress came into office that States ceased to be viable.
- (2) That since the Congress came into office the Excise Revenue has begun to dwindle. It has gone down to a vanishing point.
- (3) That Income Tax and Sales Tax have increased enormously.

These are the causes which explain why States have ceased to be viable.

The Excise Revenue is being sacrificed for a false ideology which has no meaning, no sense and no reality.

To regard to the Policy of Prohibition followed by the Congress, the following conclusions can be drawn without fear of challenge :

- (1) An enormous amount of revenue is sacrificed for nothing.

(2) People have not ceased to drink. There is enormous amount of illicit manufacture of liquor which is being sold to the public clandestinely.

(3) The money lost by Government is picked up by the illicit manufacturer.

(4) Prohibition has demoralised Society. Formerly only male members of the family drank because they alone could go to the liquor shop. Now illicit liquor manufacture has become a Home Industry. Liquor being now made at home both men and women drink.

(5) In addition to the loss of revenue on account of Prohibition Government has to undertake increased expenditure on Police to enforce Prohibition which, however, they never do.

What good is this Prohibition which does not prohibit ? The Congress threatens to extend this Prohibition to the whole of India. God bless the Congress! It is said that God first makes them mad whom He wishes to destroy. God is doing the same with Congressmen.

It is enough for me to say that Congress cannot have both viability and Prohibition.

Coming to the Land Revenue it could certainly be increased. But the Congress is afraid to touch the agriculturist for fear of losing votes. It is therefore raising money from the Sales Tax and the Income Tax both of which fall so heavily on the urban classes as is apparent from Table No. 6.

It is therefore clear that viability is no problem. Only the Congress has to revise its Taxation Policy.

Viability is a question of capacity to bear taxation and will to tax. There is enough capacity. What is wanted is will.

The whole of the Indian Taxation system requires to be changed. It is a question of altering the Constitution. I cannot deal with it now. I must reserve it for another occasion.

CHAPTER X

MAJORITIES AND MINORITIES

Politics is nothing if not realistic. There is very little in it that is academic. It is therefore follows that before passing any judgement on any scheme of politics it is essential that one must consider the ground plan.

Someone may ask what do I mean by " Ground Plan ". To me the ground plan means the social structure of a community to which the political plan is sought to be applied.

It needs no argument to show that the political structure rests on the social structure. Indeed the social structure has a profound effect on the political structure. It may modify it in its working. It may nullify it or it may even make a mockery of it.

In the case of India the social structure is built up on the caste system, the special product of Hindu civilisation and culture.

The caste system is so well known that one need not wait to explain its nature. One can straight proceed to show what effect it is likely to have on Linguistic States.

There are some peculiar features of the caste system which must however be noted—

- (1) Castes are so distributed that in any given area there is one caste which is major and there are others which are small and are subservient to the major caste owing to their comparative smallness and their economic dependence upon the major caste which owns most of the land in the village.
- (2) The caste system is marked not merely by inequality but is affected by the system of graded inequality. All castes are not on a par. They are one above the other. There is a kind of ascending scale of hatred and a descending scale of contempt.
- (3) A caste has all the exclusiveness and pride which a nation has. It is therefore not improper to speak of collection of castes as a collection of major and minor nations.

I am sorry, I cannot illustrate these points by reference to facts and figures. The census which is the only source of information on these points fails to help me. The last census omits altogether the caste tables which had been the feature of the Indian census ever since its birth. The Home Minister of the Government of India who is responsible for this omission was of the opinion that if a word does not exist in a dictionary it can be proved that the fact for which the word stands does not exist. One can only pity the petty intelligence of the author.

The consequences of the caste system on politics are quite obvious. The interesting part is to see what effect it has upon elections which is the foundation of Representative Government which is reared up on a system of single member constituencies.

The effects may be summarised as follows :

- (1) Voting is always communal. The voter votes for the candidate of his community and not for the best candidate.
- (2) The majority community carries the seat by sheer communal majority.
- (3) The minority community is forced to vote for the candidate of the majority community.
- (4) The votes of the minority community are not enough to enable the candidate to win the seat against the candidate put up by the majority community.
- (5) As consequence of social system of graded inequality the voter of the higher (major) communities can never condescend to give his vote to a candidate of a minority community. On

the other hand the voter of the minority community who is socially on a lower level takes pride in giving his vote to the candidate of the majority community. That is another reason why a candidate of a minority community loses in election.

The Congress always wins, so it is found. But no one asks why does the Congress win ? The answer is that Congress is very popular. But why is the Congress popular ? The true answer is that Congress always puts up candidates which belong to castes which are in the majority in the constituencies. Caste and Congress are closely linked. It is by exploiting the caste system that the Congress wins.

These evil consequences of the caste system are sure to be sharpened by creation of Linguistic States. Minority communities may be crushed. If not crushed they may be tyrannised and oppressed. They are sure to be discriminated against and denied equality before law and equal opportunity in public life.

The history of nations and the changes in their ideologies have been well traced by Lord Acton :

" In the old European system, the rights of nationalities were neither recognised by governments nor asserted by the people. The interest of the reigning families, not those of the nations, regulated the frontiers, and the administration was conducted generally without any reference to popular desires. Where all liberties were suppressed, the claims of national independence were necessarily ignored, and a princess, in the words of Fenelon, carried a monarchy in her wedding portion."

Nationalities were at first listless. When they became conscious:

"They first rose against their conquerors in defence of their legitimate rulers. They refused to be governed by usurpers. Next came a time when they revolted because of the wrongs inflicted upon them by their rulers. The insurrections were provoked by particular grievances justified by definite complaints. Then came the French Revolution which effected a complete change. It taught the people to regard their wishes and wants as the supreme criterion of their right to do what they like to do with themselves. It proclaimed the idea of the sovereignty of the people uncontrolled by the past and uncontrolled by the existing state." The caste is a nation but the rule of one caste over another may not be admitted to be the same as the rule of one nation over another. But supposing the case is not carried so far but is limited to majority and minority even then the question remains : What right has the majority to rule the minority ?

The answer is that whatever the majority does it is right. What complain the minorities can have ?

People who rely upon majority rule forget the fact that majorities are of two sorts : (1) Communal majority and (2) Political majority.

A political majority is changeable in its class composition. A political majority grows. A communal majority is born. The admission to a political majority is open. The door to a communal majority is closed. The politics of a political majority are free to all to make and unmake. The politics of a

communal majority are made by its own members born in it.

How can a communal majority run away with the title deeds given to a political majority to rule ? To give such title deeds to a communal majority is to establish a hereditary Government and make the way open to the tyranny of that majority. This tyranny of the communal majority is not an idle dream. It is an experience of many minorities. This experience to Maharashtrian Brahmins being every recent it is unnecessary to dilate upon it.

What is the remedy ? No doubt some safeguards against this communal tyranny are essential. The question is: What can they be ? The first safeguard is not to have too large a State. The consequences of too large a State on the minority living within it are not understood by many. The larger the State the smaller the proportion of the minority to the majority. To give one illustration—If Mahavidarbha remained separate, the proportion of Hindus to Muslims would be four to one. In the United Maharashtra the proportion will be fourteen to one. The same would be the case of the Untouchables. A small stone of a consolidated majority placed on the chest of the minority may be borne. But the weight of a huge mountain it cannot bear. It will crush the minorities. Therefore creation of smaller States is a safeguard to the minorities.

The second safeguard is some provision for representation in the Legislature. The old type of remedy provided in the Constitution were (1) certain number of reserved seats and (2) separate electorates. Both these safeguards have been given up in the new Constitution. The lambs are shorn of the wool. They are feeling the intensity of the cold. Some tempering of the wool is necessary.

Separate electorates or reservation of seats must not be restored to. It would be enough to have plural member constituencies (of two or three) with cumulative voting in place of the system of single-member constituency embodied in the present Constitution. This will allay the fears which the minorities have about Linguistic States.

[Part V](#)

THOUGHTS ON LINGUISTIC STATES

PART V

THE NEED FOR A SECOND CAPITAL

CHAPTER XI

INDIA AND THE NECESSITY OF A SECOND CAPITAL

A WAY TO REMOVE TENSION BETWEEN THE NORTH AND THE SOUTH

Can India afford to have one Capital ? That India has now one capital does not close the question. If the Capital of India is not satisfactorily located, now is the time for considering the question.

Since the departure of the British, India has only one capital and that is Delhi. Before the British, India has always had two capitals. During the Moghal period, India had Delhi as one Capital and Shrinagar in Kashmir as another Capital. When the British came they too had two capitals, one was Calcutta and another was Simla. Even when they left Calcutta for Delhi, they retained Simla as their summer Capital. The two capitals maintained by the Moghuls and by the British were the results of climatic conditions. Neither the British nor the Moghuls were able to live in Delhi or in Calcutta continuously for 12 months. The summer months in Delhi were unbearable to the Moghuls. They made Shrinagar their second capital for summer months. The summer months in Calcutta were equally unbearable to the British. They, therefore, established a second capital. To these climatic conditions must now be added three other conditions. There was no popular Government when the Moghuls ruled or when the British ruled. Now we have popular Government and the convenience of the people is an important factor. Delhi is most inconvenient to the people of the South. They suffer the most from cold as well as distance. Even the Northern people suffer in the summer months. They do not complain because they are nearer home and they are nearer the seat of power. Second is the feeling of the Southern people and the third is the consideration of Defence. The feeling of the Southern people is that the Capital of their Country is far away from them and that they are being ruled by the people of Northern India. The third consideration is of course more important. It is that Delhi is a vulnerable place. It is within bombing distance of the neighbouring countries. Although India is trying to live in peace with its neighbours it cannot be assumed that India will not have to face war sometime or other and if war comes, the Government of India will have to leave Delhi and find another place for its location. Which is the place to which the Government of India can migrate ? A

place that one can think of is Calcutta. But Calcutta is also within bombing distance from Tibet. Although India and China today are friends, how long the friendship would last no one can definitely say. The possibility of conflict between India and China remains. In that event Calcutta would be useless. The next town that could be considered as a refuge for the Central Government is Bombay. But Bombay is a port and our Indian Navy is too poor to protect the Central Government if it came down to Bombay. Is there a fourth place one could think of? I find Hyderabad to be such a place. Hyderabad Secunderabad and Bolarum should be constituted into a Chief Commissioner's Province and made a second capital of India. Hyderabad fulfils all the requirements of a capital for India. Hyderabad is equidistant to all States. Anyone who looks at the table of distances given below will realise it:

	From Delhi – miles	From Hyderabad – miles
To Bombay	798	440
To Calcutta	868	715
To Madras	1198	330
To Karnul	957	275
To Trivandrum	1521	660
To Patiala	124	990
To Chandigarh	180	1045
To Lucknow	275	770

From the defence point of view it would give safety to the Central Government. It is equidistant from all parts of India. It would give satisfaction to the South Indian people that their Government is sometimes with them. The Government may remain in Delhi during winter months and during other months it can stay in Hyderabad. Hyderabad has all the amenities which Delhi has and it is a far better City than Delhi. It has all the grandeur which Delhi has. Buildings are going cheap and they are really beautiful buildings, far superior to those in Delhi. They are all on sale. The only thing that is wanting is a Parliament House which the Government of India can easily build. It is a place in which Parliament can sit all the year round and work, which it cannot do in Delhi. I do not see what objection there can be in making Hyderabad a second capital of India. It should be done right now while we are reorganising the States.

Hyderabad, Secunderabad and Bolarum should be constituted into a second capital of India. Fortunately, it can be very easily done with satisfaction to the whole of South India, to Maharashtra and to the Andhras. This is another remedy for easing the tension between the North and the South.

Part VI

MAPS – Missing

THOUGHTS ON LINGUISTIC STATES

PART VII - STATISTICAL APPENDICES

[Appendix I : Population by Linguistic Families](#)

[Appendix II : Area and Population of States of United States of America](#)

[Appendix III : The Population of the Bombay City according to the Communities](#)

[Appendix IV : Provincial/ State Revenue](#)

[Appendix V : Budgetary Position of the States on Revenue Account](#)

[Appendix VI : Budgetary Position of the States on Revenue Account](#)

[Appendix VII : Central Revenues \(Selected Years\)](#)

**Appendix I
Population by Linguistic Families**

Language Groups	No. of languages spoken	No. of speakers as mother-tongue and subsidiary 1931 (bilinguals shown twice)	No. of speakers 1931	No. of speakers mother-tongue 1931	Difference between columns 4 & 5 (increase in 1931 + decrease in 1931-)	Difference between columns 4 & 3 (increase + decrease -)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Language of India and Burma	225	366430537	315525177	349887527	+94362350	+50905360
(I) Austric Languages						
1. Indonesian Languages	2	6542	5561	6542	+981	+981
2. Mon-Khmer Languages	10	734204	549917	726578	+176661	+184287
3. Munda Languages [f.1]	7	4710685	3973873	4609588	+635715	+736812
(II) Tibeto-Chinese Languages						
1. Tibeto-Burman Languages	128	14167611	11959011	12982840	+1023829	+2208600
2. Tai-Chinese Languages	11	1150220	926335	1027656	+101321	+223885
3. Man and Karen Languages [f.2]	17	1351291	1114617	1342278	+227661	+236674
(III) Dravidian Languages						
1. Dravida Languages	7	47032874	37285594	41454593	+4168999	+9747280
2. Intermediate Languages	5	3661277	3056598	3609418	+552820	+604679

Commented [f.2]: *The correct classification of these two languages is doubtful. Pizyluski treats them as Tai (Meillet and Cohen, *tongues du Monde* 380), but it is probable they have Austric affinities.

Commented [f.3]: *The correct classification of these two languages is doubtful. Pizyluski treats them as Tai (Meillet and Cohen, *tongues du Monde* 380), but it is probable they have Austric affinities.

3. Andhra Languages	1	28195824	23601492	26373727	+2772235	+4594332
4. N.W. Languages	1	231581	184368	207049	+22681	+47213
(IV) Indo-European Languages						
1. Eranian Languages	3	2457134	1981675	2270466	+288791	+475459
2. Dardic Languages	5	1354031	1304319	1522936	+218617	+238712
3. Indo-Aryan Languages	19	261105909	229560555	253699403	+24138848	+31545354
(V) Unclassed Languages						
1. Andamanese	2	466	580	466	+114	-114
2. Burushashi	1	26076	---	26076	+26076	+26076
3. Gipsy dialects [f.3]	6	25999	15018	25999	+10981	+10981
4. Languages not returned and unspecified	---	[f.4]29813	5664	2912	+3752	+24149
B. Languages of other Asiatic counties and Africa	17	305386	211894	302324	+90430	+93492
C. Languages of Europe	10	452099	319112	339706	+20594	+132987

Commented [f.4]: # These dialects are drawn from various Indian languages and contain such diverse elements that they cannot fairly be allotted to one family rather than another.

Commented [f.5]: ## Includes Hill and aboriginal subsidiary languages (27,841).

APPENDIX II

Area and Population of States of United States of America

Name of State	Area sq. miles	Population Est. 1944
1	2	3
1. Alabama	51,609	2,818,083
2. Arirona	113,909	638,412
3. Aricansas	53,102	1,776,446
4. California	158,693	8,746,989
5. Colorado	104,247	1,147,269
6. Connecticut	5,009	1,176,807
7. Delaware	2,057	283,802
8. Florida	58,560	3,367,217
9. Georgia	58,876	3,223,727
10 Idaho	83,557	531,573
11. Illinois	56,400	7,729,720
12. Indiana	36,291	3,419,707
13. Jowa	56,280	2,269,759
14. Kansas	82,276	1,774,447
15. Kentucky	40,395	2,630,194
16. Louisiana	48,523	2,535,385
17. Maine	33,215	793,600
18. Maryland	10,577	2,127,874
19. Massachusetts	8,257	4,162,815

20. Michigan	58,216	5,429,641
21. Minnesota	84,008	2,508,663
22. Mississippi	47,716	2,175,877
23. Missouri	69,674	3,589,538
24. Montana	147,138	464,999
25. Nebraska	77,237	1,213,792
26. Nevada	110,540	156,445
27. New Hampshire	9,304	457,231
28. New Jersey	7,836	4,167,840
29. New Mexico	121,666	532,212
30. New York	49,576	12,632,890
31. North Carolina	52,712	3,534,545
32. North Dakota	70,665	528,071
33. Ohio	41,222	638,667
34. Oklahoma	69,919	2,064,679
35. Oregon	96,981	1,214,226
36. Pennsylvania	45,332	9,247,088
37. Rhode-Island	1,214	778,972
38. South Carolina	31,055	1,923,354
39. South Dakota	77,047	558,629
40. Tennessee	42,246	2,870,158
41. Texas	267,339	6,876,248
42. Utah	84,916	606,994
43. Vermont	9,609	310,941
44. Virginia	40,815	3,119,115
45. Washington	68,192	2,055,378
46. West Virginia	24,181	1,715,984
47. Wisconsin	56,154	2,975,910
48. Wyoming	97,914	257,108

APPENDIX III

**The population of the Bombay City according to the
Communities given in the Census of 1941 is as
follows:**

Hindu	8,99,398
Scheduled Castes	1,21,352
Muslims	2,51,518
Indian Christians	1,22,683
Anglo-Indians	8,787
Parsees	58,813
Sikhs	2,418
Jains	33,281
Buddhists	912
Tribes	4,606
Others	29,847
Total	1,489,883

The area of the Bombay City according to the Census of 1941 was 30 sq. miles.

APPENDIX IIIA

Inter-Provincial Immigration And Emigration In India

Variation As Compared With 1921 In The Volume Of Migration

Within India

Province or State	Net gain + or loss —	1931		Net gain + or loss -	1921		Variation 1921-31	
		Immigrants	Emigrants		Immigrants	Emigrants	Immigrants	Emigrants
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Provinces or States which gain								
Assam	+ ,241,011	1,314,047	73,036	+1,140,752	1,216,661	75,909	+ 97,386	- 2,873
Bengal	+ 771,936	1,726,370	954,434	1,132,192	1,817,775	685,581	- 91,405	+ 68,853
Burma	+ 593,3244	617,521	24,197	+ 553,471	572,530	19,059	- 44,991	+ 5,138
Bombay	- 596,707	1,188,901	592,194	- 472,023*	1,039,622	567,599*	+ 256,074	+318
Central Provinces and Berar.	+ 27,003	649,064	422,061	+197,323	603,924	406,601	+ 45,140	+15,460
Mysore	215,462	340,700	125,238	+210,064	309,850	99,786	+ 30,850	+ 25,452
Delhi	+189,736	259,163	69,427	+113,158	182,485	69,327	-76,678	+100
Baroda	+127,907	333,077	105,176	+10,674	231,880	221,206	+101,197	-16,030
Central India Agency	+ 115,566	598,102	482,536	" 58,0*6	544,688	486,632	+ 53,414	- 4,096
Travancore	+ 83,919	133,852	49,933	+ 49,732	71,973	22,241	+ 61,879	+ 27,692
Ajmer-Merwara	+ 44,029	104,938	60,909	-) - 66,033	108,452	42,419	- 3,514	+18,490
Cochin	+ 41,424	87,214	45,790	+15,792	39,689	23,897	- 47,525	+ 21,893
Coorg	+ 35,388	38619	3,231	+ 30,988	33,838	2,850	+ 4,781	+381
Baluchistan	+ 23,779	66,542	42,763	+ 5,924	66,166	60,242	+376	-17,479
North West Frontier Province.	+21,187	111,868	90,681	+ 50,835	118,395	67,560	— 6,527	+ 23,121
Andamans and Nicobars.	+13,703	14,255	582	+14,080	14,396	316	—141	+236
Provioces or States which Lose								
Sikkim	- 4,782	2,403	7,212	- 2,297	1,836	4,133	+594	+ 3,079
Gwalior	-14,471	281,350	296,821	+632	289,657	289,025	- 8,307	+ 7,796
Jammu and Kashmir	- 33,266	61,189	94,445	- 22,685	61,561	84,246	-372	+10,029
Punjab	- 67,792	635,025	702,817	+ 60,940	591,885	530,942	+ 43,140	+171,875
Hyderabad	-19,788	312,814	332,602	-166,326	197,127	363,453	+115,687	- 30,851
Western India States Agency	-186,890	106,795	293,685		Included against Bombay			
Rajputana	-516,898	329,913	864,811	- 625,650	242,234	8,67,893	+ 87,670	- 21,082
Madras	- 888,339	246,892	1,135,231	- 718,183	196609	914,792	+ 50,283	+ 220,439
United Provinces	1,063,143	494,308	1,557,451	- 974,642	425,152	1,399,794	+ 69,156	+157,657
Bihar and Orissa	1,291,567	466,563	1,758,130	-1,567,968	387,068	1,955,036	+ 79,495	-196,906

Includes Punjab States Agency

Note—The figures for provinces include those for the States attached to them except in the case of Madras, where they exclude Cochin and Travancore

Migration figures to and from countries outside British India are excluded.

Commented [f6]: *Includes Western India Agency. .

**APPENDIX IV
PROVINCIAL/ STATE REVENUE**

	Yield (Crores of Rupees)					Share in total revenue (per cent)				
	1921-22	1936-37	1938-39	1944-45	1953-54	1921-22	1936-37	1938-39	1944-45	1953-54
					(R. E.)					(R. E.)
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Total Revenue	58.48	74.86	76.78	193.87	462.04	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Land Revenue	29.08	25.96	25.40	30.21	69.20	49.7	34.7	33.1	15.6	15.0
State excise	15.67	13.63	13.08	43.42	44.81	26.8	18.2	17.0	22.4	9.7
Stamps	10.14	10.80	9.53	15.20	23.50	17.3	14.4	12.4	7.8	5.1
Registration	1.07	1.11	1.09	2.39	3.91	1.8	1.5	1.4	1.2	0.9
General Sales Tax				7.91	57.25				4.1	12.4
Forests (net)	0.66	0.71	0.63	4.58	10.82	1.1	0.9	0.8	2.4	2.3
Irrigation works for which capital accounts are kept (net).	5.55	7.53	7.57	10.14	8.09	9.5	10.0	9.9	5.2	1.8
Devolution of revenue and grants from the Centre. (—)	9.02	2.67	6.45	36.89	117.92		3.6	8.4	19.1	25.6
Share of income tax assigned to States	3.09	0.04	1.47	25.75	56.90	5.3	0.1	1.9	13.3	12.3
Share of jute duty assigned to States		2.13	2.51	1.48			2.8	3.3	0.8	
Share of Central excise duty assigned to States					15.94					3.5
Grant of aid etc. from the Centre.	12.11	.5	2.47	9.66	45.08		.7	3.2	5.0	9.8

Figures for 1921-22 exclude those for Burma but include Sind as part of Bombay. Figures for 1936-37 exclude those for Burma, Sind and N.W.F.P

Transfers from funds are excluded, receipts under forests are taken net after deducting entire expenditure from gross receipts, for other public utilities and State undertaking net receipts (after deducting working expenses) are included.

APPENDIX V

Budgetary Position of the States on Revenue Account

Figures for 1938-39 and 1944-45 are for nine Provinces excluding Sind and N.W.F.P

Figures for 1953-54 relate to all Part A, Part B and Six Part C States

PART "A" STATES

	1950-51	1951-52	1952-53	1953-54* [f6] (R.E.)	1954-55 (B.E.)
Revenue	93.33	106.70	108.12	112.21	121.76
Expenditure	81.93	100.33	105.88	115.85	127.65

Commented [f7]: Figures for 1953-54 include budget estimates for the composite state of Madras and revised estimates are available for later six months only.

Surplus (+) or deficit (-)	(+) 1.45	(+) 6.17	(+)3.24	(-)3.64	(-) 5.89
Surplus (+) or deficit (-) (excluding transfers from and to Revenue Reserve Funds)	(+) 1.45	(+)5.97	(+)3.24	(-)3.64	(-) 5.89

APPENDIX VI

Budgetary Position of the States on Revenue Account PART "B" STATES

	1950-51	1951-52	1952-53	1953-54* (R.E.)	1954-55 (B.E.)
Revenue	214.37	315.60	229.32	357.49	367.17
Expenditure	293.08	309.10	329.37	371.64	400.89
Surplus (+) or deficit (-)	(+) 1.29	(+) 6.50	(-)0.15	(-)14.15	(-) 33.72
Surplus (+) or deficit (-) (excluding transfers from and to Revenue Reserve Funds)	(-) 3.15	(-)2.25	(-) 12.01	(-)20.82	(-) 39.86

APPENDIX VII

Central Revenues (Selected Years)

	1921-22		1936-37		1938-39		1944-45		1953-54 (R.E.)	
Total Revenue* [f7]	80.00	100	81.45	100	82.90	100	334.40	100	394.34	100
Customs (net)	31.61	39.5	38.11	46.8	40.51	48.9	39.77	11.9	160.00	40.6
Taxes on income (net)	18.74	23.4	14.33	18.8	13.74	16.6	80.52	24.1	69.31	17.6
Corporation tax					2.04	2.5	84.22	25.2	38.4	9.7
Central excise duties (net) . .	2.80	3.5	13.35	16.4	8.66	10.5	38.14	11.4	78.00	19.8
Salt duty	6.34	7.9	8.81	10.8	8.12	9.8	9.29	2.8		
Commercial Departments—										
Railways (net contribution)	(-)9.09				1.37	1.7	32.00	9.6	7.50	1.9
Posts & Telegraphs (net) . .			.14	0.2	0.19	0.2	10.25	3.1	2.02	0.5

Commented [f8]: Total revenue includes net receipts under opium, irrigation. Forests, electricity and road transport schemes. Figures for 1921-22 and 1936-37 are inclusive of those for Burma. Figures for 1921-38-39 and 1944-45 relate to undivided India.

THOUGHTS ON LINGUISTIC STATES

Contents

PART VII - STATISTICAL APPENDICES

[Appendix VIII : Population of the Indian Union by Communities](#)

[Appendix IX : Statistics of Chief Castes](#)

[Appendix X : Relative Population of Different Communities](#)

APPENDIX VIII Population of the Indian Union by Communities

	HINDUS											
	Population			Scheduled Castes			Others			Muslims		
	Persons	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Madras	49,841	24,800	25,040	8,152	4,064	4,088	35,095	17,466	17,630	3,927	1,939	1,987
Bombay	29384	15184	14200	2526	1217	1256	20691	1068	10011	2463	1321	1142
West Bengal	21837	11834	10003	3520	1847	1673	11206	6160	5046	5544	3011	2533
United Provinces	56346	29542	26804	11931	6128	5803	34923	18411	16512	8692	4574	4117
East Punjab	12697	6853	5844	1028	540	487	4489	2435	2053	4427	2380	2047
Bihar	36546	18325	18220	4344	2135	2209	22263	11252	11010	4719	2340	2379
C.P. & Berar	19948	9845	9802	3310	1639	1671	10920	5491	5428	811	425	387
Assam	7685	4068	3617	377	203	174	2885	1564	1321	1754	939	815
Orissa	13768	6706	7062	1865	906	956	8187	3963	4224	166	81	85
Ajmer	589	310	279	1	0.5	0.5	30	198	182	90	49	41
Andaman & Nicobar Islands	34	21	12	---	---	---	8	6	3	8	6	2
Bilaspur	110	57	53	16	8	7	93	48	45	1	0.8	0.6
Bhopal	785	410	375	187	96	91	410	215	195	110	59	51
Coorg	169	92	76	26	15	11	105	56	49	14	9	6
Cutch	501	239	262	39	19	20	279	135	144	117	57	60
Delhi	918	535	383	23	69	53	445	262	182	305	176	128
Himachal Pradesh	935	495	441	229	120	109	672	356	316	29	16	13
Manipur	512	249	263	---	---	---	304	148	156	30	15	15
Tripura	513	272	241	12	6	6	336	178	158	124	66	57
Vindhya Pradesh	3569	1819	1750	399	202	197	2851	1455	1397	95	49	46
Madhya Pradesh	7141	3734	3407	437	221	216	5025	2648	2377	475	251	224
P.E.P.S.U.	3424	1868	1557	214	112	102	978	530	448	899	483	416
Rajasthan	13085	6868	6217	---	---	---	9878	5196	4682	1256	663	593
Saurashtra	3556	1809	1747	242	122	120	2737	1402	1336	436	220	226
Travancore Cochin	7493	3742	3751	537	269	268	3902	1931	1971	543	276	268
Hyderabad	16339	8347	7992	2928	1487	1442	10382	5303	5073	2097	1080	1017
Kashmir	4022	2130	1892	113	61	53	694	369	325	3074	1627	1446
Mysore	7329	3763	3566	1405	723	682	5282	2702	2580	485	258	227

APPENDIX IX

Statistics of Chief Castes

Caste	Strength	Where chiefly found
Agri	265,285	Bombay.
Ahar, Ahir, Gopi, Goshi, Goala Golla, Gowari, Gaura, Kavundan Idaiyan.	14,170,032	Most Provinces.
Ahom	249,434	Assam.
Arain, Kunjra, Koeri, Kachli, Murao.	5,048,849	Most Provinces.
Arora, Bhansali, Lohana	1,499,407	Baluchistan, Bombay, N.W.F.P.

		Panjab, Jammu and Kashinir, W.I. States
Babhan, Bhuinihar	1,113,541	Bihar and Orissa, U.P.C.P.
Baidya	110,739	Bengal.
Baiga, Bhania, Binjwar, Bharia, Kadar, Bhumia, Bhunjia, Bhuiya, Ghatwar, Naiya, Pao.	1,050,760	Bengal, Bihar and Orissa, C.P., C.I, Rajputana, Sikkim.
Bairagi	838,285	Most Provinces.
Baloch	1,333,215	Baluchistan, Bombay, Punjab, N.W.F.P.
Baniya, Bhatia, Chetti, Khatri, Kamati (Vaishya).	5,176,383	Most Provinces,
Banjara, Lumbadi, Labana, Lamani.	951,022	Bombay, C.P., C.L. Gwalior-Hyderabad, Mysore, Rajputana
Bania, Bhalia, Chodhra, Gedia, Khant, KOLI, Kotwal, Naikda, Patclia, Patanwadia, Thakarda, Talabda, Valvi.	3,418,643	Most Provinces.
Bauri, Bagdi	1,671,481	Bengal, Bihar and Orissa, Rajputana.
Bawaria, Bavari, Baori, Bagari, Vagri, Badhik.	309,720	Most Provinces.
Bayar, Barmanu, Dhangar, Musahar.	811,746	Bengal, Bihar and Orissa, U.P., Central India.
BeDar, Boya	991,536	Bombay, Madras, Hyderabad, C.P.
Bhandari, Idiga, Iruvan, Siyal	1,253,403	Bihar and Orissa, Cochin, Mysore, Madras, Travancore, Rajputana, Baroda.
Bhangi	797,599	Ajmer-Merwara, Bombay, U.P., Baroda, Gwalior, Rajputana, W. I. States
Bharwad, Dhangar, Gadariya, Kumba.	1,816,283	Most Provinces.
Bhat, Barhmabhatt, Chamn, Jasondhi.	397,274	Most Provinces
Bhatra, Pardhana, Parja	353,183	Madras, C.P. and Berar.
Bhil, Barda Bhilala. Dhanka, Mankar, Mavchi, Pathia, Rathia, Tadv.	1,454,144	Most Provinces.
Bhisti, Bhoi, Dhimar, Jhinwar, Kabar, Machhi, Tiyar.	3,575,941	Most Provinces.
Bohra	212,752	Bombay, Baroda, C.I., Gwalior, C.P., Rajputana, W.I. States Travancore.
Brahman	15,207,277	Most Provinces.
Brahui	224,415	Baluchistan, Bombay.
Chamar, Khalpa, Samagara	12,195,516	Most Provinces.
Chasa, Raju	835,236	Bengal, Bihar and Orissa.
Chasi, Kajbartta (Mahisya)	2,381,266	Bengal.
Chuhra	721,981	N.W.F. Piov. Punjab, Delhi.
Dhanuk, Kandra	758,671	Bihar and Orissa, Bengal, C.P., C.I., Ajmer-Merwara, Rajputana, Delhi, Gwalior.
Dhobi, Parit, Vanran, Velutte-dan.	3,161,428	Most Provinces.
Dom, Dombor, Bansphor, Dharkar, Dholi.	907,776	Most Provinces.
Dhor, Chak. kiyall	671,926	Bombay, C.P., Madras, Cochin, Travancore, W.I. States.
Dusadh	1,400,878	Bengal, Bihar and Orissa, U.P.
Fakir	820,577	Punjab, U.P., C.P., Rajputana C.I., Agency Gwalior.
Garó, Hajong, Kachari, Mech, Rabha.	695,648	Assam, Bengal.

Gond, Dhanwar, Kalota, Kamar, Karwar, Kolam, Kondh, Konda, Dora, Koya, Maria, Muria Nagarchi.	4,719,222	Andamans and Nicobars, Bengal, Bihar and Orissa, Bombay, C.P., and Berar, Madras, U.P. C.I. Hyderabad, Gwalior, Rajputana.
Gujar	2,430,669	Ajmer-Merwara, Bombay, C.P. and Berar, Delhi, N.W. Frontier, Punjab, U.P., C.I., Rajputana.
Guria, Halwai	246,583	Bihar and Orissa, U.P., C.I., Rajaputana, Gwalior.
Hajjam, Ambattan, Bhandari, Kelashi, Mhali, Nadig, Nai " Naibrahman ", Napit, Nhavi, Pandithar, Vellakat-talavan.	3,725,860	Most Provinces.
Hari	418,830	Assam, Bengal, Bihar and Orissa Madras.
Jat	8,377,819	N.W. Frontier, Punjab, U.P. Kashmir, Rajputana.
Jogi	111,586	Gwalior, C.I., Agency, Rajputana, Jammu and Kashmir.
Kaikolan	419,078	Madras, Cochin, Travancore.
Kalar	1,017,179	Ajmer-Merwara, Bengal, C.P. and Berar, U.P., Baroda, C.I., Gwalior, Hyderabad, Rajputana, Sikkim.
Kallavan, Maravan	948,630	Madras, Cochin, Travancore.
Kamalan, " Viswabrahman ", Panchal.	7,735,393	Most Provinces.
Karen	1,367,673	Burma.
Kayastha, Karan, Prabhu . .	2,946,228	Most Provinces.
Kewat, Kaibartta	1,813,278	Assam, Bengal, Bihar and Orissa, C.P. and Berar, U.P.
Kolita	109,250	Bihar and Orissa, C.P. and Berar.
Koshti, Devang	921,201	Bengal, Bombay, C. P. and and Berar, Madras, C.I., Hyderabad, Mysore, Gwalior, Cochin.
Khandayat, Paik	1,060,587	Bihar and Orissa, Bengal, Madras.
Kisan	431,044	Bengal, Bihar and Orissa, U.P.
Khasi, Synteng .	232,595	Assam, Andamans and Nico-bars.
Khatik, Chick	412,520	U.P., C.P., Bengal, Delhi, Ajmer-Merwara, Baluchistan Hyderabad, Rajputana Gwalior.
Kori, Katia, Balai, Chaupal, Jugi.	2,165,953	Most Provinces.
Korku, Korwa	246,765	Bihar and Orissa, C.P., C.I., U.P.
Kumhar, Kusavan	3,580,143	Most Provinces.
Kunbi, Karbi, Kurmi, Kshatriya, Kapu, Kapewar, Raddi, Vakkaliga, Vellala	11,082,108	Most Provinces.
Labbai	374,829	Coorg, Madras, Mysore, Travancore.
Lodhi	1,742,470	C.P. and Berar, U.P., C.I., Bengal, Delhi, Rajputana, Hyderabad, Gwalior.
Lushei, Sokte, Thado	192,520	Assam, Bengal, Burma.
Mahar, Mehra, Dhed, Vankar, Holiya, Pulayan, Cheruman.	4,729,405	Most Provinces.
Mala	852,050	C.P. and Berar, Madras.
Mali, Phulmali, Saini, Malakar	2,332,143	Most Provinces.
Mailah, Goriya, Gonrhi	894,951	Bengal, Bihar and Orissa, U.P., N.W. Frontier, C.I., Gwalior, Rajputana.
Mang, Megh, Meghwal, Madgi, Madiga.	2,556,765	Most Provinces.
Mapilla	139,621	Travancore, Cochin, Coorg, Burma.

Maratha	6,113,061	Bombay, C.P. and Berar, Gwalior, Hyderabad, Baroda Mysore, C.L
Meithei	330,545	Assam, Burma.
Mina, Meo	1,110,479	Most Provinces.
Mirasi	283,637	Punjab, N.W. Frontier, Rajputana, Ajmer-Merwara, Jammu and Kashmir, C.I., Gwalior.
Mochi, Jiagar, Dabgar	1,026,405	Most Provinces.
Momin	3,122,100	Most Provinces.
Munda, Mawasi, Ho, Kol, Kharwar, Kharia, Bhogia, Bhumji, Kora.	2,315,276	Bihar and Orissa, Bengal, C.P. and Berar, C.Y. U.P., Raj-plitena.
Naga	272,529	Assam, Burma., Gwalior.
Namasudra	2,265,476	Assam, Bengal.
Nayar	1,550,641	Madras, Travancore, Cochin.
Nepali	371,906	Most Provinces.
Nunlya, Od, Beldar, Bind, Rehgar.	561,926	Most Provinces.
Oraon	1,021,334	Bengal, Bihar arid Orissa. C.P. and Berar.
Pallan	825,224	Madras.
Pan, Panka, Ganda, Paidi, Baraik.	1,241,322	Bengal. Bihar and Orissa, C.P. and Berar, Madras, C.I.
Paraiyan, Turi	1,277,365	Madras, Bombay, Baroda, Cochin, W.I. States, Coorg.
Pasi, Arakh	1,743,166	Bihar and Orissa, U.P., Bengal, C. I.
Oinjara, Sarahira, Dhunia . .	565,254	U. P., Bombay, Rajputanft Gwalior, N.W. Frontier, Punjab, C.I., Mysore, W.I States, Jammu and Kashmir.
Rajbhar, Rajjhar, Rajwar Bhar.	630,708	U. P., Bihar and Orissa, Bengal, C.P. and Berar.
Rajput	10,743,001	Most Provinces.
Santal, Saunta, Karmali	2,524,472	Bengal, Bihar and Orissa, C.I.
Saun	480,131	U.P., C.I.
Sawara, Saonr, Savar, Saharia	675,628	Bihar and Orissa, C.P., Madras, U. P., .C.I., Rajputana, Gwaiior.
Shaha, Sunri	533,825	Bengal, Madras, Sikkim.
Shan	900,204	Burma.
Silpkar	333,036	U.P.
Singpho, Kachin	156,253	Burma, Assam.
Talavla, Dubla	229,190	Bombay, Buroda, W.L States.
Tamboli, Barai	452,423	Bengal U.P., C.I., Rajputana, Gwalior, Baroda.
Tankshatriya	926,274	Most Provinces.
Tanti, Tatwa, Bhulia, Chadar, Sali.	1,132,563	Bengal, Bihar, and Orisia, Bombay, C.P. and Berar.
Telaga	1,669,559	C.
Teli, Tili, Chakkan. Ganig, Chanchi, Varniyan.	5,024,496	Madras, Hyderabad, Coorg.
Thakkar, Rathi, Rawat, Kanet, Ghirath.	71 4,503	Bombay, Punjab, C.I., Gwalior, Jammu and Kashmir, Rajputana.

APPENDIX X - Relative Population of Different Communities

Distribution by Religion of 10,000 persons in India, in the Provinces and in the States, 1921 and 1931

Province etc.	Year	Hindu	Muslim	Buddhist	Tribal	Christian	Sikh	Jain	Others
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
India	1921	6,856	2,174	366	309	150	103	37	5
	1931	6,824	2,216	365	236	179	124	36	20
Provinces	1921	6,606	2,407	465	280	123	96	18	5
	1931	6,548	2,469	468	213	142	118	17	25
Ajmer-Merwara	1921	7,356	2,055		96	112	4	372	5
	1931	7,755	1,734		27	124	6	348	6
Andamans and Nicobars	1921	3,278	1,515	979	3,387	586	144		111
	1931	2,586	2,280	988	3,379	496	220		51
Assam	1921	5,434	2,896	17	1,479	168	1	5	
	1931	5,720	3,196	17	825	235	3	3	1
Baluchistan	1921	920	8,731	4		159	182		4
	1931	894	8,744	1	1	174	181	1	4
Bengal	1921	4,327	5,399	57	181	31		3	2
	1931	4,304	5,487	63	105	36	2	2	1
Bihar and Orissa	1921	8,284	1,085		553	76	1	1	
	1931	8,231	1,132		544	91	1	1	
Bombay	1921	7,658	1,974	1	64	137	4	111	51
	1931	7,605	2,039	1	59	145	10	92	49
Burma	1921	368	380	8,506	534	195	4	1	12
	1931	390	399	8,430	444	226	7	1	103
C.P. and Berar	1921	8,354	405		1,160	30	1	49	1
	1931	8,601	440		872	33	3	50	1
Coorg	1921	7,733	795	1	1,265	194		12	
	1931	8,939	844			210		5	2
Delhi	1921	6,569	2,904			273	57	96	1
	1931	6,285	3,253	1		267	101	84	9
Madras	1921	8,864	671		137	322		6	
	1931	8,831	707		75	380		7	
N.W.F.P.	1921	666	9,162			47	125		
	1931	590	9,184			51	175		
Punjab	1921	3,181	5,533	1		159	1,109	17	
	1931	2,684	5,655	2		176	1,299	15	169
United Provinces	1921	8,509	1,428			44	3	15	1
	1931	8,440	1,484			42	10	14	
States	1921	7,748	1,343	12	415	250	126	104	2
	1931	7,771	1,347	12	316	307	141	101	5

N.B. - A blank indicates that the number per 10,000 fractional; 0 indicates that none at all were returned. In the case of Assam the Khasi States are indicated in the 1921 figures; Otherwise all States are excluded from Provinces.