

DOCUMENTATION

The purpose of this section is to make available to the readers official documents such as reports of committees, commissions, working groups, task forces, etc., appointed by various ministries, departments, agencies of central and state governments and international organisations, which are not readily accessible either because they are old, or because of the usual problems of acquiring governmental publications, or because they were printed but not published, or because they were not printed and remained in mimeographed form. We also present in this section, official documents compiled from scattered electronic and/or other sources for ready reference of the readers. It will be difficult and probably not worthwhile to publish the documents entirely. We shall publish only such parts of them as we think will interest our readers. The readers are requested to send their suggestions regarding official documents or parts thereof for inclusion in this section.

We are also keen to publish Papers, Notes or Comments based on the material included in this section. We invite the readers to contribute the same to our journal, which we shall consider for publication in subsequent issues of the journal, after the usual refereeing process.

In the present section, we publish:

1. *Report of The States Reorganisation Commission*, Government of India in the Ministry of Home Affairs, No. 53/69/53-Public, dated 29th December, 1953
2. Ambedkar, B.R., *Thoughts on Linguistic States*, Anand Sahitya Sadan, Siddhartha Marg, Chhawani - 20, Aligarh - 202001. (First Published 1955)*

*We are thankful to Shri Prakash Ambedkar for kindly permitting us to reproduce here the original paper in its entirety.

REPORT OF THE STATES REORGANISATION COMMISSION, 1955

CONTENTS

	Pages
Introduction	357
Part I. The Conditions of the Problem	
I. States of the Indian Union	359
II. Rationale of Reorganisation	365
III. Time for Reorganisation	371
Part II. Factors Bearing on Reorganisation	
I. Cost of Change	374
II. Unity and Security of India	377
III. Language and Culture	380
IV. Financial Viability	388
V. Requirements of National Development Plans	391
VI. Regional Planning and a Balanced Economy	393
VII. Smaller vs. Larger States	395
VIII. Some Other Factors	396
Part III. Proposals for Reorganisation	
I. Basic Pattern of the Component Units	399
II. Madras	408
III. Kerala	410
IV. Karnataka	413
V. Hyderabad	420
VI. Andhra	426
VII. Bombay	427
VIII. Vidarbha	433
IX. Madhya Pradesh	435
X. Rajasthan	441
XI. The Punjab	444
XII. Delhi	455
XIII. Uttar Pradesh	458
XIV. Bihar	462
XV. West Bengal	465
XVI. Assam	472
XVII. Manipur	480
XVIII. Orissa	481
XIX. The Reorganised Units	483
Part IV. Administrative and Allied Matters	
I. Safeguards for Linguistic Groups	484
II. The Integration of Services	492
III. Financial and other Administrative Measures	494
IV. The Unity of India	499
Notes and Summary	
I. Note on Himachal Pradesh	506
II. Note on Uttar Pradesh	509
III. Summary of Conclusions and Recommendations	515
Appendices	
I. Appendix-A	522
II. Appendix B	523

REPORT OF THE STATES REORGANISATION COMMISSION 1955

INTRODUCTION

On 22nd December, 1953, the Prime Minister made a statement in Parliament to the effect that a Commission would be appointed to examine "objectively and dispassionately" the question of the Reorganization of the States of the Indian Union "so that the welfare of the people of each constituent unit as well as the nation as a whole is promoted". This was followed by the appointment of this Commission under the Resolution of the Government of India in the Ministry of Home Affairs, No. 53/69/53-Public, dated 29th December, 1953 (Appendix A).

2. The task before the Commission has been set out in paragraph 7 of this Resolution in the following terms:

"The Commission will investigate the conditions of the problem, the historical background, the existing situation and the bearing of all important and relevant factors thereon. They will be free to consider any proposal relating to such reorganisation. The Government expect that the Commission would, in the first instance, not go into the details, but make recommendations in regard to the broad principles which should govern the solution of this problem and, if they so choose, the broad lines on which particular States should be reorganised, and submit interim reports for the consideration of Government."

3. Under this Resolution the Commission were required to make recommendations to the Government of India not later than 30th June, 1955. This period was subsequently extended to 30th September, 1955.

4. According to their terms of reference, the Commission were at liberty to devise their own procedure for collecting information and for ascertaining public opinion. After giving careful thought to the procedure to be followed, the

Commission issued a Press Note on 23rd February, 1954 (Appendix B), inviting written memoranda from members of the public as well as public associations interested in the problem of the reorganisation of States. The relevant portion of this Press Note is given below:

"The States Reorganisation Commission, after giving due consideration to the procedure that would be most suitable for the expeditious execution of the task entrusted to them, have decided to dispense with a questionnaire. They invite members of the public as well as public associations interested in the problem of the reorganisation of States to put their views and suggestions before the Commission by submitting written memoranda on matters on which they feel they can assist them. The Commission expect that wherever any concrete suggestions are made they will be supported by historical and statistical data and, if any proposal regarding the formation of any new State or States is made, it will, if possible, be accompanied by one or more maps, as the case may be."

5. It was announced in this Press Note that all memoranda should reach the Commission by 24th April, 1954. However, on account of the keen interest evinced by public organisations as well as the people in general in various aspects of reorganisation, and the nature of our enquiries, we did not adhere to this time limit, and communications ranging from simple telegrams indicating the wishes of particular localities to well-considered memoranda dealing with the problem as a whole continued to come almost to the very end of our appointed task. The total number of such documents received by us reached the figure of 1,52,250. The bulk of these communications is accounted for by simple telegrams, printed resolutions etc., denoting the wishes of particular localities to be included within one or the other unit. The number of well-considered memoranda does not exceed about 2,000.

6. Side by side with the study of these memoranda, we commenced interviewing people from all walks of life. These interviews were held in private to enable the persons interviewed to express their views freely and frankly. The interviews started in New Delhi from 1st March, 1954, and were continued till about the end of July, 1955. We started on 8th April, 1954, on our all-India tour-during the course of which we covered virtually the entire country-and visited 104 places which involved traveling over thirty eight thousand miles. We have interviewed over nine thousand persons.

7. We made every effort to get a complete cross-section of public opinion. Care was taken to see that all those who represent public-opinion were heard unless they were themselves averse to expressing any views. The people interviewed included members of political parties, public associations, social workers, journalists, municipal and district board representatives and other people representing cultural, educational, linguistic and local interests. The purpose of the all-India tour was not only to ascertain public opinion but also to make on-the-spot studies at different places and to understand the background of the problem and the popular sentiment on various aspects of reorganisation.

8. Under our terms of reference, it was open to us to submit an interim report, but at a fairly early stage we came to the conclusion that the submission of any interim report would not be feasible. The problems in peninsular India and some parts of the country outside it are interconnected and we, therefore, did not consider it desirable to formulate our views on any question in isolation. We accordingly decided to study the various problems over the entire country before coming to any final conclusions about any particular region. This excluded the possibility of our submitting an interim report.

9. In our examination of the various proposals for reorganisation we have mainly relied on statistical figures as given in the Censuses of various years. The Census figures for 1951 have been compiled according to what are known as "Census tracts". It has, therefore, been difficult to estimate the mother-tongue figures on a taluk or tehsil-wise basis. We were given to understand that it might be possible to make estimates of taluk or tehsil-wise figures on the basis of certain statistical assumptions. Having regard, however, to the controversies which surround such assumptions, we took into consideration only the figures as printed in different Census reports in reaching our conclusions.

10. We have been cautious also with our financial estimates. We have studied in some detail the possible financial position and the economic potentialities of each of the proposed units. We have been reluctant, however, to lay undue emphasis on these estimates as figures of revenue and expenditure depend, to some extent, on imponderable factors. It may be theoretically possible to raise revenue in a particular unit according to a phased taxation programme, but whether such taxation will be imposed depends, at least to some extent, on political considerations. Control of expenditure in the broadest sense is also influenced by non-economic considerations. We did not consider it safe, therefore, to project present figures of revenue and expenditure into the future.

11. On the other hand, these financial estimates have some validity, because no unit will really start from scratch. It will have a certain financial heritage and a pattern of revenue and expenditure to begin with, and the picture of its financial position, at least in the near future, is not likely to be strikingly different from the present pattern. We have given some weight, moreover, to a study of the potentialities of economic development in

the proposed units. Our financial estimates, therefore, represent only broad judgments of what is probable.

12. Our report is divided into four Parts. Part I deals with the conditions of the problem of reorganisation of States and its historical background. Part II deals with the factors bearing on reorganisation. Part III contains our proposals for the reorganisation of the existing units. In Part IV we have discussed briefly the administrative and other implications of reorganisation and measures which might be adopted to minimise the stress of transition.

13. Before we conclude this introductory Chapter we wish to place on record our deep appreciation of the invaluable assistance we have received from the Secretariat of the Commission and all members of the staff. Had it not been for their ungrudging help and devoted work, cheerfully and efficiently rendered, it would not have been possible for us to complete our difficult task within the period at our disposal. We should also like to express our thanks to members of the public and representatives of political organisations and public associations who responded to our Press Note by submitting written memoranda containing much useful information and statistical and other material.

PART I
THE CONDITIONS OF THE PROBLEM
CHAPTER I STATES OF THE INDIAN UNION

14. The existing structure of the States of the Indian Union is partly the result of accident and the circumstances attending the growth of the British power in India and partly a by-product of the historic process of the integration of former Indian States. The division of India during the British period into British provinces and Indian States was itself fortuitous and had no basis in Indian history. It was a mere accident that, as a result of the abandonment, after the upheaval of

1857, of the objective of extending the British dominion by absorbing princely territories, the surviving States escaped annexation. The map of the territories annexed and directly administered by the British was also not shaped by any rational or scientific planning but "by the military, political or administrative exigencies or conveniences of the moment".¹

15. The provincial organisation of British India was meant to serve a two-fold purpose: to uphold the direct authority of the supreme power in areas of vital economic and strategic importance and to fill the political vacuum arising from the destruction or collapse of the former principalities. Of these two, the first was obviously the primary objective, and it required the suppression of the traditional regional and dynastic loyalties. This was sought to be achieved by erasing old frontiers and by creating new provinces which ignored natural affinities and common economic interests. The administrative organisation of these provinces was intended to secure their subordination to the Central Government, which was the agent and instrument of imperial control exercised from London. This process inevitably led to the formation of units with no natural affinity.

16. During the early phase of the rise of the British power in India, moreover, the accretion of territories was gradual and the need for the rationalisation of administrative units was not seriously felt. British dominion in India started with small settlements in the coastal regions established at different times during the seventeenth century. From the middle of the eighteenth century they provided the bases from which British authority expanded inwards by the acquisition of further territories which were attached to one or the other of the three presidencies.

1. Constitutional Reforms, 1918, para. 39.

17. The Presidencies of Madras and Bombay had practically acquired their final shape by 1801 and 1827 respectively. Accretion of fresh territories to the Bengal Presidency, however, continued up to the year 1865.

18. The Charter Act of 1833 had provided for the creation of a fourth presidency out of the overgrown Presidency of Bengal, to be called the Agra Presidency. It was, however, considered expedient later to set up a less expensive form of government for the new province, and accordingly the North-West Provinces were set up under a Lt.-Governor in 1836 by detaching from Bengal all British territories west of Bihar. The Punjab, annexed in 1849, was the next province to be formed. It extended at that time up to the then north-west frontier of India. Placed first under a Board of Administration and later, in 1853, under a Chief Commissioner, the Punjab was made a Lt.-Governor's province on the transfer of Delhi to it in 1859.

19. Oudh, annexed in 1856, constituted a Chief Commissionership until it was joined to the North-West Provinces in 1877. The Central Provinces were formed in 1861 by taking the Saugor and Nerbada districts out of the North-West Provinces and joining them with the territories of the Raja of Nagpur that had been acquired in 1854. Assam, attached to the Bengal Presidency on its acquisition in 1826, was made a separate Chief Commissioner's province in 1874. In 1901 the strategically important north-west frontier regions were detached from the Punjab and constituted into a separate Chief Commissioner's province. This also resulted in the North-West Provinces and Oudh being renamed the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh.

20. Thus far the formation of provinces had been mainly governed by considerations of administrative convenience and economy and by reasons of military strategy and security. To the extent, therefore, there was a conscious or

deliberate design behind the demarcation of the territories of administrative units, it was grounded in imperial interests or the exigencies of a foreign government and not in the actual needs, wishes or affinities of the people. Administrative convenience itself required compact units with some measure of homogeneity. In some cases, therefore, various factors conducive to the growth of natural units operated in the background. They were, however, subordinate to the prime considerations of administrative and military exigencies.

21. With the emergence of nationalism as a new factor in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, the policy of balance and counterpoise began to override purely administrative considerations in making territorial changes, though on such occasions arguments based on administrative needs and other principles were also put forward. Thus, Bengal, undoubtedly unwieldy as it included at that time also Bihar and Orissa, was divided with a view at least as much to dispersing revolutionary elements as to securing more manageable administrative units.

22. In 1905 Bengal was divided to form, along with Assam, the provinces of (a) East Bengal and Assam and (b) Bengal, which included the western part of Bengal, Bihar, Orissa and Chota Nagpur. The change in the outlook regarding provincial boundaries was reflected in the famous Resolution of Lord Curzon, dated 19th July, 1905, which, while providing for the partition of Bengal, also commented on the proposed territorial realignment of areas between Madras, the Central Provinces and Bengal. Thus, "reasons of administrative expediency, arising out of the peculiar linguistic and racial conditions and the geographical conformation of Ganjam and the Agency tracts of Vizagapatam" were cited against the transfer of these areas from the Government of Madras. "Commercial considerations" were relied upon for the continued retention of the

districts of Chota Nagpur under the Bengal Government. The linguistic principle was mentioned in support of the transfer of certain Oriya-speaking tracts from the Central Provinces to Bengal; and the principle of close contact between the governors and the governed was put forward to justify the concentration of the "typical Muhammadan population" of Bengal in a separate province of East Bengal and Assam.

23. Six years later the partition of Bengal was annulled, though it was considered impossible both on "political and on administrative grounds" to revert to the *status quo ante*. In 1912 Assam was reconstituted into a Chief Commissioner's province and the eastern and western parts of Bengal were rejoined to form the province of Bengal. At the same time, Bihar, with Orissa and Chota Nagpur, was constituted into a separate province of Bihar and Orissa.

24. These changes were made in order to provide convenient administrative units and to satisfy the legitimate aspirations of the people of Bengal. At the same time, they sought to give the Muslims "a position of approximate numerical equality with or-possibly of small superiority over the Hindus" in the new Bengal, formed after the detachment of Bihar and Orissa, which province was intended to give the Hindi-speaking population "a fair opportunity for development". The settlement was supposed to be "so clearly based upon broad grounds of political and administrative expediency as to negative any presumption that it has been exacted by clamour or agitation".

25. The shape of the provinces and the principles underlying their formation, before and after 1905, continued, however, to be very far from satisfactory. As late as 1930 British statesmen

themselves admitted that there were in India "only a number of administrative areas" which had "grown up almost haphazard as the result of conquest, super session of former rulers or administrative convenience".² The desirability of a reorganisation of provinces on a rational, basis was pointed out earlier by the authors of the Report on Indian Constitutional Reforms, 1918, who had observed: "We are impressed with the artificial, and often inconvenient character of existing administrative units".³ The Indian Statutory Commission, 1930, endorsed this view and observed: "Although we are well aware of the difficulties encountered in all attempts to alter boundaries and of the administrative and financial complications that arise, we are-making a definite recommendation for reviewing, and if possible resettling, the provincial boundaries of India at as early a date as possible".⁴ The Commission recommended the examination of the question by a Boundaries Commission under a neutral chairman.⁵

26. The Commission made a special mention of Orissa. "An urgent case for consideration and treatment", it observed, "is that of the Oriya-speaking peoples, most, but not all, of whom are now-included in Orissa, because we consider that so close a union as now-exists between Orissa and Bihar is a glaring example of the artificial connection of areas which are not naturally related".⁶

27. The province of Orissa was created in 1936 by joining together the Oriya-speaking areas of the provinces of Bihar and Orissa, the Central Provinces and Madras.

2. Report of the Indian Statutory Commission, Vol. II para. 25

3. Report on Indian Constitutional Reforms, 1918, para. 246.

4. Report of the Indian Statutory Commission, Vol. II, para. 25.

5. *Ibid*, para. 38.

6. *Ibid*.

Integration of the Indian States

28. The administrative units of British India have remained virtually intact after the achievement of Indian Independence. The only changes which have been made so far as these units are concerned are the formation of a separate Andhra State and the merger in these units of some of the territories of the former Indian States.

29. So far, however, as the former Indian States are concerned the period immediately following the transfer of power to India saw a revolutionary change come over them with dramatic speed. Of about six hundred units known as Indian or princely States,

- (a) 216 States having a population of a little over 19 millions were merged in the provinces;
- (b) 61 States having a population of about 7 millions were constituted into new Centrally-administered units; and
- (c) 275 States with a population of about 35 millions were integrated to create new administrative units, namely, Rajasthan, Madhya Bharat, Travancore-Cochin, Saurashtra and PEPSU.⁷

Only three States, namely, Hyderabad, Mysore and Jammu & Kashmir, survived these processes of integration, but the internal structure of these States as also their relationship with the Centre were cast into a new mould so as to fit them into the constitutional structure of India.

30. While factors such as linguistic and ethnic homogeneity or historical tradition were taken into consideration to the extent practicable in the process of integrating these diverse units with adjoining provinces or constituting them into separate administrative units, the compulsion of the dynamic urges of the time necessitated prompt

decisions. A number of settlements, therefore, made in respect of these States had to be in the nature of transitional expedients.

31. The princely States, as they existed at the time of the transfer of power, were themselves in varying phases of development. Their integration into the new democratic Constitution of India involved many problems, both administrative and political. So far as the political structure was concerned, in most States it was a form of direct personal rule; and even in the States which had introduced some of the forms of democratic government, the personal authority of the Ruler was hardly affected: So far as administration was concerned, while some of the larger States had developed a fairly efficient machinery, in most cases it was of a rudimentary character.

32. It was, therefore, inevitable that some of the features of the old order should be found in the Indian Constitution and leave an impress on the administrative and political structure of the units comprising territories of the erstwhile princely States.

Disparate Status of the Constituent Units

33. A peculiar feature of the Indian Constitution is the disparate status of the constituent units of the Union. The Constitution recognises three categories of States and gives each category a pattern and status of its own. The status of the first two categories of States, i.e., those specified in Parts A and B of Schedule I of the Constitution, is based on the concept of federalism. Apart from the institution of Rajpramukh, the main feature that distinguishes Part B States from Part A States is the provision contained in Article 371, which vests in the central executive supervisory authority over the governments of these States for a specified period. This provision is no doubt, un-federal in character, but it does not alter the basic relationship between these States and the

7. White Paper on Indian States, 1950, para. 147.

Centre, which essentially rests on the principle of a clear division of powers between the Centre and the States. Part C States which rank lowest in the hierarchy, are, however, administered by the Centre on a unitary basis. The devolution of powers to the legislatures and governments of some of these States under the Government of Part C States Act, 1951, does not detract from the legislative authority of Parliament over these States or from the responsibility of the Union Government to Parliament for their administration.

34. Apart from the States of the Union, there are also territories specified in Part D of Schedule I, which form part of India. In respect of such territories as also of any territory comprised within the territory of India but not specified in this Schedule, the Central Government has not only full executive authority but also regulation-making power.⁸

Historical Background of the Classification of States

35. If the present alignment of the boundaries of States has been largely determined by the vicissitudes of British rule in India and the integration of the former Indian States, the same holds true also of their existing constitutional classification into different categories.

36. Even before the Act of 1935 introduced, to a limited extent, the federal principle in the governance of this country, the relative status of administrative units *vis-a-vis* the Central Government had varied from one category to another. This was to a certain extent due to the historical reason that different parts of the country were acquired and their administration organised by the British at different times, so that they could not be patterned as units of an administrative structure constituted on a systematic and rational

basis. Considerations of economy and administrative expediency also led the British rulers to give to newly-organised and smaller provinces less expensive and simpler government than that of the older, more settled, and developed provinces.

37. By the close of the nineteenth century, there were in existence three different forms of provincial governments, namely, those under a Governor and Executive Council, those administered by a Lieutenant Governor and those administered by a Chief Commissioner. Many of the British Indian provinces, such as Assam, Bihar and Orissa, the Central Provinces, the North-West Frontier Province, the Punjab and the United Provinces, passed through one or both of the earlier stages before acquiring the Governor-and-Council form of government.

38. The difference in the form of government of a province carried with it a difference in status. It is, no doubt, true in a sense that, after 1833, all the provincial governments became agents of the Central Government. Still the different categories were clearly distinguishable in their status. A broad distinction was made between territories which were under the immediate authority and management of the Central Government and those which were not. To the former category belonged all territories not included in Governorships or Lt.-Governorships, i.e., the provinces administered through Chief Commissioners.

39. A distinction was also made between "major provinces" and "minor administrations". In the first category were included the Governors' provinces, Lt.-governors' provinces and the two largest Chief Commissionerships, i.e., Assam and the Central Provinces, whose Chief Commissioners were, in practice, entrusted with powers merely as wide as those of a Lt.-Governor. All the other Chief Commissionerships were called "minor administrations" and were administered

8. Constitution of India, Article 243.

under the direct control of the Central Government acting, except in the case of Ajmer-Merwara, British Baluchistan and the North-West Frontier Province, mainly through the Home Department. The North-West Frontier Province and British Baluchistan constituted a special class because of their strategic importance and special political problems. Central control over these, as well as over Ajmer-Merwara, was exercised through the Foreign and Political Department of the Government of India.⁹ It was these "minor administrations" which, on account of their geographical position and other special characteristics, continued to be centrally-administered, while the territories which were initially placed under a Chief Commissioner mainly because of administrative expediency, acquired more advanced forms of government in course of time.

40. The Government of India Act, 1935, recognised, in the circumstances in which it was formulated, three categories of component units, namely, Governors' provinces, federating Indian States and Chief Commissioners' provinces. This classification is reflected in the grouping of the States of the Indian Union as Parts A, B and C States, except that not all the former Indian States are now represented by Part B States, a number of them having been merged in the provinces or consolidated into centrally-administered areas. A departure, however, from the old classification is the recognition under the Constitution of two categories of centrally-administered areas, namely, Part C States and Part D territories, as against only one such category recognised under the Act of 1935.

States not Pre-Existing Sovereign Units

41. Another important feature of the States of the Indian Union is that none of them represents

a pre-existing sovereign unit. The units corresponding to the Part A States, namely, Governors' provinces, were administered until 1937 on a unitary basis, although from 1919 there was a certain measure of devolution of powers to the provinces. With the enforcement of the provincial part of the federal scheme embodied in the Act of 1935, certain subjects were assigned to the provinces on a federal basis, but the federal principle was heavily circumscribed by the special powers of the Governors, in the exercise of which they were answerable to the Governor-General. The Chief Commissioners' provinces, although recognised as constituent units of the federation, continued to be administered on a unitary basis. It was only in the case of the former Indian States that the right of accession on a negotiated basis was conceded. Rulers of these States, no doubt, claimed a measure of sovereignty, but this sovereignty was severely overborne by the paramouncy of the British Crown, not only in the field of external affairs but also in respect of internal administration. Whatever the content of the sovereignty of the rulers, it was surrendered by them to the national Government of India before the commencement of the Constitution.

42. Thus, none of the constituent units of India was sovereign and independent in the sense the American colonies or the Swiss Cantons were before they decided to pool their sovereignty to form federal unions. Accordingly, the Constituent Assembly of India, denying its power from the sovereign people, was entirely unfettered by any previous commitment in evolving a constitutional pattern suitable to the genius and requirements of the Indian people as a whole. Consequently, unlike most other federal legislatures, Parliament, representing the people of India as a whole, has been vested with the exclusive power of admitting or establishing new

9. Report on Indian Constitutional Reforms, paras, 43 and 44.

States, increasing or diminishing the area of an existing State or altering its boundaries, the legislature or legislatures of the States concerned having only the right to an expression of views on the proposals.¹⁰ It is significant that for making such territorial adjustments it is not necessary even to invoke the provisions governing constitutional amendments. "Unlike the United States of America, therefore, the Indian Union is not an "indestructible Union composed of the indestructible States" in that the Union alone is indestructible but the individual States are not."¹¹

Changes since the Adoption of the Constitution

43. At the time of the commencement of the Constitution, there were nine Part A States, eight Part B States and ten Part C States. Since then, Parliament has, by law, established a new Part A State, namely, Andhra, and merged one Part C State, namely, Bilaspur, in another such State - Himachal Pradesh.

CHAPTER II RATIONALE OF REORGANISATION

44. The demand for the reorganisation of States is often equated with the demand for the formation of linguistic provinces. This is because the movement for redistribution of British Indian provinces was, in a large measure, a direct outcome of the phenomenal development of regional languages in the nineteenth century which led to, an emotional integration of different language groups and the development amongst them of a consciousness of being distinct cultural units. When progressive public opinion in India, therefore, crystallised in favour of rationalisation of administrative units, the objective was conceived and sought in terms of linguistically homogeneous units.

45. Recent years have, however, seen some shift in emphasis on the linguistic principle and a growing realisation of the need to balance it with other factors relevant to the reshaping of the political geography of India, such as national unity and administrative, economic and other considerations. In the paragraphs which follow, we shall trace the evolution of thought on the rationale and objectives of the reorganisation of States with particular reference to the concept of linguistic States.

The British approach

46. As we have observed earlier, during the British period, territorial changes were governed mainly by imperial interests. However, as an ostensible factor the linguistic principle figured, for the first time, in a letter from Sir Herbert Risley, Home Secretary, Government of India, to the Government of Bengal, dated 3rd. December, 1903, in which the proposal for the partition of Bengal was first mooted. Later, in the partition Resolution of 1905, and in the dispatch of Lord Hardinge's government to the Secretary of State, dated 25th August, 1911, proposing the annulment of partition, language was again prominently mentioned. The linguistic principle was, however, pressed into service on these occasions only as a measure of administrative convenience, and to the extent it fitted into a general pattern which was determined by political exigencies. In actual effect, the partition of Bengal involved a flagrant violation of linguistic affinities. The settlement of 1912 also showed little respect for the linguistic principle, in that it drew a clear line of distinction between the Bengali Muslims and Bengali Hindus. Both these partitions thus ran counter to the assumption that different linguistic groups constituted distinct units of social feeling with common, political and economic interests.

10. Constitution of India, Articles 2, 3 and 4.

11. Munro: The Government of the United States, 5th edition, p. 591

47. The authors of the Montagu-Chelmsford Report, 1918, not burdened with the task of finding a posteriori, reasoning for decisions taken on political grounds, approached the problem with greater objectivity. They examined the suggestion for the formation, within the existing provinces, of sub-provinces on a linguistic and racial basis, with a view mainly to providing suitable units for experiment in responsible government. Although they rejected the idea as impracticable, they commended the objective of smaller and more homogeneous units. "We cannot doubt", they observed, "that the-business of government would be simplified if administrative units were both smaller and more homogeneous; and when we bear in mind the prospect of the immense burdens of government in India being transferred to comparatively inexperienced hands, such considerations acquire additional weight. It is also a strong argument in favour of linguistic or racial units of government that by making it possible to conduct the business of legislation in the vernacular, they would contribute to draw into the arena of public affairs men who were not acquainted with English".¹²

48. Twelve years later, the question of redistribution of provinces was considered by the Indian Statutory Commission, who recognised that the provincial boundaries, as they then existed, embraced, in more than one case, areas and population of no natural affinity and separated those who might under a different scheme be more naturally united. Speaking of the factors which should govern redistribution, the Commission stated:

"If those who speak the same language form a compact and self-contained area, so situated and endowed as to be able to support its existence as a separate province, there is no doubt that the use of a common speech is a

strong and natural basis for provincial individuality. But it is not the-only test-race, religion, economic interest, geographical contiguity, a due balance between country and town and, between coast line and interior, may all be relevant factors. Most important of all perhaps, for practical purposes, is the largest possible measure of general agreement on the changes proposed, both on the side of the area that is gaining, and on the side of the area that is losing, territory"¹³

The Commission thus gave only qualified support to the linguistic principle. It attached great importance to agreement amongst the people affected by the changes.

49. The Indian Statutory Commission's view that the question could not be settled by any single test received support from the O'Donnell Committee, which was appointed in September, 1931, to examine and report on the administrative, financial and other consequences of setting up a separate administration for "the Oriya-speaking peoples" and to make recommendations regarding its boundaries in the event of separation. In framing their proposals, the Committee took into account all relevant factors, such as language, race, and the attitude of the people, geographical position, economic interests and administrative convenience. But more than all these factors, the Committee claimed to attach "great, indeed, primary importance' to the wishes of the inhabitants where they can be clearly ascertained."¹⁴

50. Sind came into existence, along with Orissa, in April, 1936, but the demand for this province was conceded mainly to placate Muslim opinion. The Indian Statutory Commission, while expressing sympathy with the claim for the separation of Sind, had taken the view that there were

12. Report on Indian Constitutional Reforms, 1918, para. 246.

13. Report of the Indian Statutory Commission, Vol. II, para. 38.

14. Report of the Orissa Committee (O'Donnell Committee), Vol. I, para. 6.

grave administrative objections to isolating Sind and depriving it of the powerful backing of Bombay before the future of the Sukkur Barrage was assured and the major adjustments which it would entail had been effected.¹⁵ However, the Joint Committee on Indian Constitutional Reforms, 1933-34, took note of the fact that separation of Sind had been pressed not merely by the Sindhi Muslims but also by Muhammadan leaders elsewhere in India and recommended it on the ground that "apart from other considerations, the communal difficulties that would arise from attempting to administer Sind from Bombay would be no less great than those which may face a separate Sind administration".¹⁶

The approach of the Indian National Congress

51. The Indian National Congress lent indirect support to the linguistic principle as early as 1905 when it backed the demand for annulling the partition of Bengal which had resulted in the division of the Bengali-speaking people into two units. Yet another concession to the linguistic principle was the formation of a separate Congress province of Bihar in 1908,¹⁷ and of the Congress provinces of Sind and Andhra in 1917. This involved a deliberate departure from the normal organisational pattern which had so far followed the boundaries of the existing administrative provinces. However, at this stage, Congress opinion had not clearly crystallised in favour of linguistic provinces and at the session of 1917 the principle was strongly opposed by the group led by Dr. Annie Besant.

52. It was only some thirty-five years ago that the Indian National Congress was converted officially to the view that linguistic provinces were desirable. It was at its 1920 session at

Nagpur that the Congress accepted the linguistic redistribution of provinces as a clear political objective and in the following year the principle was adopted for the purposes of its own organisation.

53. In 1927, following the appointment of the Indian Statutory Commission, the Congress adopted a resolution expressing the opinion that "the time has come for the redistribution of provinces on a linguistic basis" and that a beginning could be made by constituting Andhra, Utkal, Sind and Karnataka into separate provinces. Those supporting the resolution spoke of the right of self-determination of the people speaking the same language and following the same tradition and culture.

54. The question of redistribution of provinces was also examined by the Nehru Committee of the All Parties Conference, 1928. The Committee lent its powerful support to the linguistic principle in the following terms:

"If a province has to educate itself and do its daily work through the medium of its own language, it must necessarily be a linguistic area. If it happens to be a polyglot area difficulties will continually arise and the media of instruction and work will be two or even more languages. Hence it becomes most desirable for provinces to be regrouped on a linguistic basis. Language as a rule corresponds with a special variety of culture, of traditions and literature. In a linguistic area all these factors will help in the general-progress of the province".¹⁸

55. The Nehru Committee recommended that the redistribution of provinces should take place on the basis of the wishes of the population, language and geographical, economic and financial principles. Of all these factors, however, in the opinion of the Committee, "the main

15. Report of the Indian Statutory Commission, Vol. para. 38.

16. Report of the Committee on Indian Constitutional Reforms, Vol. I, para. 57.

17. B. Pattabhi Sitaramayya-History of the Indian National Congress, Vol. I, P. 147.

18. Report of the Nehru Committee, All Parties Conference, 1928, p. 62.

considerations must necessarily be the wishes of the people and the linguistic unity of the area concerned".¹⁹ It will be of interest, however, to note that the Committee, while recognising that the argument for the separation of Sind was very strong on the grounds that it was a definite linguistic area and that the great majority of the people demanded separation, regretted that they could not take the declaration of the Sind National League to "cut their coat according to their cloth", as a final solution of the financial problem.²⁰

56. Between the years 1928 and 1947, the Congress reaffirmed its adherence to the linguistic principle on three occasions:

- (i) at its Calcutta session held in October, 1937, it reiterated its policy regarding linguistic provinces and recommended the formation of the Andhra and Karnataka provinces;
- (ii) by a resolution passed at Wardha in July, 1938, the Working Committee gave an assurance to the deputations from Andhra, Karnataka and Kerala that linguistic redistribution of the provinces would be undertaken as soon as the Congress had the power to do so; and
- (iii) in its election manifesto of 1945-46, it repeated the view that administrative units should be constituted as far as possible on a linguistic and cultural basis.

57. The Congress election manifesto of 1945-46, which assured the people that provinces would be constituted on a linguistic and cultural basis, not in every case but as far as it was possible in the circumstances of each case, would appear to be the first attempt to qualify the linguistic principle. There was a perceptible change, however, in the outlook of the Congress leaders on the subject with the Partition and the achievement of Independence. These brought in their wake

unthought-of problems, giving rise to serious doubts as to whether the old pledges could be redeemed in the new conditions.

58. Speaking before the Constituent Assembly (Legislative) on 27th November, 1947, soon after Partition, the Prime Minister, while conceding the linguistic principle, remarked: "First things must come first and the first thing is the security and stability of India". This was, followed by the appointment, on the recommendation of the Drafting Committee of the Constituent Assembly, of a Linguistic Provinces Commission, known as the Dar Commission, for the purpose of enquiring into and reporting on the desirability or otherwise of the creation of any of the proposed provinces of Andhra, Karnataka, Kerala, and Maharashtra and fixing their boundaries and assessing the financial, economic, administrative and other consequences in those provinces and the adjoining territories of India. It follows from the terms of reference of this Commission that reconstitution of provinces solely on a linguistic basis was no longer taken for granted.

59. The Dar Commission reported to the Constituent Assembly in December, 1948. It not only expressed itself strongly against any reorganisation being undertaken in the prevailing circumstances but also held that the formation of provinces exclusively or even mainly on linguistic considerations would be inadvisable. The Commission felt that in forming provinces the emphasis should be primarily on administrative convenience. The homogeneity of language should enter into consideration only as a matter of administrative convenience.²¹ The Commission emphasised that everything which helped the growth of nationalism had to go forward and everything which impeded it had to be rejected or should stand over.²² Among many other factors

19. Report of the Nehru Committee, All Parties Conference, 1928, p. 61.

20. *Ibid.*, pp. 68-69.

21. Report of the Linguistic Provinces Commission, para. 131.

22. *Ibid.*, para. 147.

which should be given due weight the Commission mentioned history, geography, economy and culture.²³

60. In the opinion of the Commission, if new States, formed after taking into consideration all these factors, possessed linguistic homogeneity also, that would be an additional advantage.²⁴

61. The Dar Commission listed certain "generally recognised" tests which a linguistic area must satisfy before it could be formed into a province. These were:

- (i) geographical contiguity and absence of pockets and corridors;
- (ii) financial self-sufficiency;
- (iii) administrative convenience;
- (iv) capacity for future development; and
- (v) a large measure of agreement within its borders and amongst the people speaking the same language in regard to its formation, care being taken that the new province should not be forced by a majority upon a substantial minority of people speaking the same language.²⁵

62. Soon after the Dar Commission had submitted its report, the Indian National Congress appointed at its Jaipur Session in December, 1948, a Committee to consider the question of linguistic provinces and to review the position in the light of the report of the Dar Commission and the new problems that had arisen since Independence. The Committee, known as the J.V.P. Committee, which consisted of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel and Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya, was the first Congress body to sound a note of warning against the linguistic principle. It stated that:

- (a) when the Congress had given the seal of its approval to, the general principle of linguistic provinces it was not faced with the practical application of the principle and hence it had not considered all the implications and consequences that arose from this practical application;²⁶
- (b) the primary, consideration must be the security, unity and economic prosperity of India and every separatist and disruptive tendency should be rigorously discouraged;²⁷
- (c) language was not only a binding force but also a separating one;²⁸ and
- (d) the old Congress policy of having linguistic provinces could only be applied after careful thought had been given to each separate case and without creating serious administrative dislocation or mutual conflicts which would jeopardise the political and economic stability of the country.²⁹

The Committee admitted that if public sentiment was insistent and overwhelming the practicability of satisfying public demand with its implications and consequences must be examined. However, it imposed two limitations on the possible satisfaction of such a demand:

- (i) that, at least in the beginning, the principle might be applied only to well-defined areas about which there was mutual agreement; and
- (ii) that all the proposals which had merit behind them could not be implemented simultaneously.

The report stated that a beginning could be made with the creation of Andhra.³⁰

23. *Ibid.*, para. 131.

24. *Ibid.*, paras. 151 and 152(4).

25. Report of the Linguistic Provinces Commission, para 10.

26. Report of the Linguistic Provinces Committee, Congress. p. 2.

27. *Ibid.*, pp. 4, 5 and 15.

28. *Ibid.*, p. 7.

29. *Ibid.*, p. 15.

30. Report of the Linguistic Provinces Committee, Congress, pp. 15-16.

63. The J.V.P. Committee's report was adopted by the Congress Working Committee in April, 1949. Since then, the Congress has broadly adhered to the views expressed in this report. This would be clear from the election manifesto issued by the Congress in 1951 and the resolutions passed by it since 1949.

64. The manifesto declared that the decision about the reorganization of States would ultimately depend on the wishes of the people concerned but expressed the opinion that, while linguistic reasons were important, there were other factors also, such as economic, administrative and financial considerations, which had to be taken into account. As a practical example, the Congress agreed to the formation of the Andhra State because the Andhra Provincial Congress, the Tamilnad Congress and the Madras Government had agreed to it, but withheld support to the proposal for the formation of a Karnataka State for want of agreement of the great majority of the people including the people of Mysore State.

65. A question which has become important since 1951 is the Implementation of the five-year plan. This found a specific mention in the All-India Congress Committee resolution adopted at Hyderabad in January, 1953.

66. The latest Congress stand on the subject as announced at the Hyderabad Session in January, 1953, and reiterated in the Working Committee resolution adopted in May, 1953, and further reaffirmed at Kalyani in January, 1954, is that in considering the reorganisation of States all relevant factors should be borne in mind, such as the unity of India, national security and defense, cultural and linguistic affinities, administrative convenience, financial considerations and economic progress both of the States and of the nation as a whole. It may be noted that there was emphasis both at Hyderabad and at Kalyani on

the unity of India and national security which, as the Kalyani resolution says, "must be given first priority".

Views of other Parties

67. The linguistic redistribution of States also figured prominently in the election manifestos of other political parties. The Socialist Party expressed itself in favour of the redistribution of States on a linguistic basis consistently with geographical contiguity and economic viability. The Communist Party stood for national States enjoying wide powers including the right of self-determination. The Kisan Mazdoor Praja Party advocated the appointment of a high-power committee to go into the whole question of the redistribution of States including the question of bilingual border areas. The Hindu Maha Sabha believed in the policy of formation of provinces on a linguistic basis but was of the opinion that due regard should be paid to the problem of defence and to other factors like area and economic stability.

The creation of Andhra

68. The post-1947 period also witnessed the formation of the Andhra State. The J.V.P. Committee had suggested that a beginning could be made with Andhra. The Committee had, however, suggested in its report certain general principles, one of which required that disputed areas should not be included in the new provinces. Accordingly, Madras city, which was a disputed area, was not to form part of Andhra. The Prime Minister made it clear in his statements in Parliament in December, 1952, that Government could proceed with the formation of the Andhra State only according to the principles of the J.V.P. Committee. After the death of Shri Potti Sriramulu, the Government of India announced their decision to establish the State of Andhra "consisting of the Telugu-speaking areas of the

present Madras State but not including the City of Madras". Shri Justice Wanchoo was appointed to report on the financial and other implications of the decision.

69. In his report submitted in February, 1953, Shri Justice Wanchoo recommended the transfer of the Bellary district to Andhra with the provision that, if and when a Karnataka State was formed, the Kannada-speaking areas of the district should go to that State. However, the Government of India decided to include in Andhra only the three taluks of the district which had a Telugu majority, and to transfer the other taluks, excepting Bellary, to Mysore State. The decision of the Government of India in respect of Bellary taluk was deferred because it was felt that "in view of its very mixed population not only its linguistic composition but certain other matters would also need examination before a final decision is reached".³¹

70. Following this decision, Shri Justice Misra was asked to examine and report on the future of the Bellary taluk after taking into consideration all relevant factors which were to include "linguistic composition and cultural affinity, administrative convenience and economic well-being". On the basis of the recommendations made in Shri Justice Misra's report, the Government of India decided to transfer the whole of Bellary taluk to the State of Mysore.

71. On August 10, 1953, a Bill was introduced in the House of the People "to provide for the formation of the Andhra State". The State of Andhra, which, according to the statement made by the Deputy Home Minister in Parliament on 17th August, 1953, was a province which approximated as much as possible to a linguistic province, came into existence on 1st October, 1953.

CHAPTER III TIME FOR REORGANISATION

72. As we have stated earlier, the desirability of the redistribution of provincial territories was recognised from time to time even by British statesmen. As early as May, 1903, Lord Curzon, the then Governor-General, considered the time to be appropriate for such an undertaking, because of

- (i) absence of political passions on the subject;
- (ii) preparedness of educated public opinion for redistribution; and
- (iii) availability of experienced administrators with special knowledge of the areas involved.

However, the only result of Lord Curzon's initiative in the matter was the first partition of Bengal.

73. The Montagu-Chelmsford Report, 1918, recognised the need of a general redistribution, but did not consider the time opportune for such changes, because they considered it unwise to undertake simultaneously the revision of the Constitution and of the political geography of the country. It expressed the view that redistribution "ought in any case to follow, and neither to precede nor accompany, constitutional reform and suggested "that it should be recognised as one of the earliest duties incumbent upon all the reformed provincial Governments to test provincial opinion upon schemes directed to this end".³²

74. The Indian Statutory Commission also recommended a readjustment of provincial boundaries, particularly in view of the change in the status of provinces consequent on a substantial decentralisation of powers, and the ultimate

31. Shri Justice Misra's Report, para. 2, p. 2.

32. Report on Indian Constitutional Reforms, 1918, para 246.

establishment of a federation of which the provinces would form units. The Commission was conscious of the very great difficulties in the way of redistribution, but urged that the main cases in which provincial readjustment seemed called for, be investigated by a Boundaries Commission to be set up by the Government of India.³³ No such Commission was, however, set up, the only changes introduced following this recommendation being those relating to the creation in April, 1936, of Sind and Orissa as separate provinces.

75. During the period between 1936 and 1947, major political and constitutional issues and the prosecution of the war engaged the attention of the government and nothing further was heard about the reorganisation of provinces.

76. After the transfer of power to India, the question was examined by the Linguistic Provinces Commission of the Constituent Assembly in July-December 1948, and the J.V.P. Committee, appointed by the Congress, which reported in April, 1949. Both these bodies were concerned with the limited question of the formation of certain linguistic provinces. However, they suggested the postponement of the formation of new provinces on grounds which could be applied to a large extent to the general question of the reorganisation of States.

77. The Dar Commission recommended that no new provinces should be formed for the time being and that the question could be taken up when India had been physically and emotionally integrated, the Indian States problem solved, the national sentiment strengthened and other conditions were favourable,³⁴ on the grounds that

- (i) India was burdened with problems more urgent than the problem of the redistribution of provinces, such as those, of defense, food, refugees, inflation and production;
- (ii) it could not afford to add to its anxieties the heat, controversy and bitterness which the demarcation of boundaries and the allotment of capital cities of Bombay and Madras would involve;
- (iii) the economic consequences of splitting up of existing provinces into several new provinces required a great deal of study, preparation and planning; and
- (iv) the administrative personnel available at the time were inadequate to bear the additional burden of running new governments.³⁵

78. The J.V.P. Committee generally concurred in this view and did not consider the time opportune for reorganisation, because it was likely to

- (i) divert attention from more vital matters;
- (ii) retard the process of consolidation of the nation's gains;
- (iii) dislocate the administrative, economic and financial structure of the country and seriously interfere with the "progressive solution of our economic and political difficulties"; and
- (iv) let loose, while we were still in the formative stage, forces of disruption and disintegration.³⁶

79. The Committee, however, admitted that if public sentiment was "insistent and overwhelming" they would have to submit to it, subject to certain limitations in regard to the "good of India as a whole" and other conditions specified by them.³⁷

33. Report of the Indian Statutory Commission, Vol. II, para. 38. p. 26.

34. Report of the Linguistic Provinces Commission, paras. 138 and 152(3)

35. *Ibid.* para. 132

36. Report of the Linguistic Provinces Committee, Congress, p. 9.

37. *Ibid.*, pp. 15-16.

80. A similar view was taken by the Prime Minister when he spoke on 7th July, 1952, in the House of the People on the resolution for the reorganisation of States on a linguistic basis. He emphasised that "we must give the topmost priority to developing a sense of unity in India and anything that might come in the way of that unity might perhaps be delayed a little", and added that at a time when the world was hanging on the verge of a crisis it was extraordinarily unwise to unsettle and uproot the whole of India for a theoretical approach or a linguistic division.

81. With the appointment of this Commission, the problem is now again before the country, with opinion divided on the appropriateness of the time for undertaking large-scale changes in the existing set-up.

82. Those opposed to reorganisation argue that:

- (a) there has been no marked change in the situation, internally or externally, which would justify the view that factors which made the consideration of any proposal for the reorganisation of States inadvisable in 1948 and 1952 have now disappeared;
- (b) problems created by the Partition, including the complicated problem of Kashmir, have still to be settled;
- (c) the international situation and developments across the borders do not admit of any dissipation of national energies and resources;
- (d) the economic development of the country continues to demand the highest priority; and
- (e) any large-scale changes in the existing set-up are bound to generate provincial feelings and impair national solidarity.

83. The opponents of reorganisation have accordingly suggested the postponement of the whole issue for a period of at least twenty or twenty-five years to allow for the creation of a

proper atmosphere in the country so that we might concentrate during this period on other matters of vital national importance.

84. These arguments are not without substance. While internally as well as externally the situation is, no doubt, easier than it was immediately after the attainment of Independence, neither the international scene nor the economic and other problems facing the country would justify a complacent attitude. It is also true that any large scale reorganisation of States is likely to involve a heavy financial and administrative burden on the resources of the country. But this logic must yield now to the realities of the situation which render further postponement of the question impracticable.

85. The problem of reorganisation has become emergent, because. India, with her programme of large, scale planning, has to think in terms of enduring political units. A direct and regrettable outcome of the present state of uncertainty is that there has been a general reluctance to invest funds in the disputed areas.

86. One of the main impediments in the way of reorganisation was that a certain measure of territorial inviolability was enjoyed by the former Indian States, both under the British rule and during the period immediately following the transfer of power. The integration of these states has, however, removed this impediment and has paved the way for a rational approach to the problem.

87. It may be recalled in this connection that the Indian Statutory Commission had considered it extremely important "that the adjustment of provincial boundaries and the creation of proper provincial areas should take place before the new process has gone too far. Once the mould has set, any maldistribution will be still more difficult to

correct".³⁸ This applies in a greater measure to the ill-assorted units representing territories of some of the former Indian States whose future should be considered, before vested interests get too strongly entrenched and reasonable settlement becomes difficult. 88. The appointment of this Commission itself has given rise to expectations and prepared the country psychologically for the readjustment of state territories. The Commission has had the benefit of the views of prominent leaders of public opinion and has received valuable material on the various aspects of reorganisation. Unless a constructive approach is now recommended, it will cause a sense of frustration with all its attendant evils.

89. A good deal of reasoning against the reorganisation of States has also been coloured by the presumption that reorganisation must lead to a linguistic redistribution of States. But for this tendency to equate reorganisation with the formation of linguistic States, there would be a fair measure of agreement on the desirability of rationalising the existing units. Thus, for instance, informed public opinion is agreed on the point that the present classification of States into three categories can no longer be defended, and that of the two alternatives of equalising the status of the existing small units with that of Part A States or their merger in adjoining larger milts, the latter is more practicable.

90. It would, perhaps, have been possible to defer the process for some time, but the decision to create the State of Andhra and the events leading to it have precipitated matters. Even without this decision, so long as the political parties stand committed to the policy of reorganisation, further deferment of a general reorganisation might lead to more dissatisfaction.

91. The task of redrawing the political map of India must, therefore, be now undertaken and accomplished without avoidable delay, in the hope that the changes which are brought about will give satisfaction to a substantial majority of the Indian people.

PART II

FACTORS BEARING ON REORGANISATION

CHAPTER I. COST OF CHANGE

92. Although the Resolution appointing this Commission vests in this body full discretion to consider any proposal or principle bearing on reorganisation, the Government of India have indicated some broad principles which should govern the consideration of the problem. The relevant portion of this Resolution is quoted below:

"The language and culture of an area have an undoubted importance as they represent a pattern of living which is common in that area. In considering a reorganisation of States, however, there are other important factors which have also to be borne in mind. The first essential consideration is the preservation and strengthening of the unity and security of India. Financial, economic and administrative considerations are almost equally important, not only from the point of view of each State, but for the whole nation. India has embarked upon a great ordered plan for her economic, cultural and moral progress. Changes which interfere with the successful prosecution of such a national plan would be harmful to the national interest".

93. The principles that emerge may be enumerated as follows:

- (i) preservation and strengthening of the unity and security of India;
- (ii) linguistic and cultural homogeneity;
- (iii) financial, economic and administrative considerations; and

38. Report of the Indian Statutory Commission, Vol. II, 'pare. 38.

(iv) successful working of the national plan.

94. Before we go into these and other principles relevant to the task with which we are charged, it would be well to take note of the unsettling consequences of reorganisation. The pace of change in recent years has been such and the changes themselves have been so far-reaching that there has been a general tendency to assume that the administrative and financial consequences of reorganisation cannot be serious. This is an unrealistic view. Changes in the existing set-up resulting in the breaking up of old ties and the creation of new associations must involve, at least during the transitory phase, a large scale dislocation of the administrative machinery, no less than of the life of the people. As the J.V.P. Committee has pointed out, whatever the origin of the existing units, and however artificial they might have been, a century or so of political, administrative and, to some extent, economic unity in each of the existing State areas, has produced a certain stability and a certain tradition. Any change would naturally have an upsetting effect.

95. To begin with, parliamentary legislation in terms of Articles 3 and 4 of the Constitution, in order to give effect to any scheme of reorganisation, must itself entail a great deal of effort and time. If one were to judge by existing tensions, the proceedings in State Assemblies, preceding parliamentary legislation, may be protracted and may give rise to strong feelings. Reorganisation of States on a rational basis may also necessitate a number of constitutional amendments which will add considerably to the burden of piloting legislation concerning reorganisation proposals.

96. The problems of transition will, by no means, be over with the passage of enabling legislation. In the first instance, there is the difficult question of the unification of the laws in force in the areas which might be grouped together. The laws extant in the existing administrative units, including those governing such

vital matters as land tenure, agrarian reforms and prohibition, are not the same even in the geographically contiguous States. There has been no uniform attempt in the recent past, when mergers have taken place, to apply straightaway the laws and regulations of one predominant area to the whole State. Some States have had to depart from this principle because of the prevalence of social and economic conditions in those areas justifying disparity in laws. In some States old laws are still operative because of the delay in completing the process of unification of laws.

97. The initial phase of transition during which two or more sets of laws are applicable in one State cannot, however, last for any length of time. Apart from *prima facie* objections on general grounds and the administrative inconvenience which it will involve, lack of uniformity in the application of tax laws will make budgeting difficult, and the lack of uniformity, in so far as it involves discrimination without justification, may even prove to be bad in law. For these reasons every reorganised State will have to undertake, in the initial years, a laborious and exhaustive review of its existing legislation.

98. The process of disintegration and re-integration of the existing administrative units must also entail serious dislocation of the administration. It involves a difficult process of integrating the service personnel belonging to one State with the personnel of another State; retrenchment of surplus and unsuitable personnel, if necessary; introduction of unified pay scales; re-fixation of cadres; re-determination of relative seniority in the different services, etc. It may also be necessary in consequence of reorganisation to devote attention in the initial years to the basic structure of the administration in some of the States, that is to say, the system of district administration, the number of districts and other administrative units and sub-units.

99. In the case of the Part B and Part C States this administrative integration has proved to be a complex problem. In spite of the fact that the utmost importance was attached at the highest level to the early completion of this process, there are some States where it is still to be completed. In the light of this experience it cannot be anticipated that the transition will be easy.

100. In the case of Andhra it was possible, to some extent, to hasten separation. But for various reasons (such as that *inter se* seniority was not disturbed, that surplus staff was retained by the residuary State, and that no great changes in the number or the constitution of the districts were involved), Andhra cannot be regarded as a good precedent. Moreover, the Andhra administration has itself had to face such difficulties as the dispersal of its offices, absence of duplicate records, and lack of experienced staff. It cannot, on the whole, be anticipated that reorganised administrative machinery will start functioning smoothly in the new States within a short period.

101. This must be regarded as the indirect cost of change; to the extent that revision of salaries after reorganisation becomes inevitable (and such a revision, it must be remembered, can only be upwards), there will also be a direct recurring cost. It is not possible or necessary to attempt a forecast of this cost except to indicate broadly the magnitude of the problem. One estimate which has been made on certain assumptions is that the lump sum provisions which will be needed in order to introduce uniform scales of pay may run into ten or eleven crores per annum. Without necessarily accepting this estimate, it may be assumed that one of the consequences of reorganisation will be the intensification of the existing demands for salary revision to such an extent as to render an increase in State Governments' expenditure unavoidable.

102. Whether there is or there is not a case for salary revision is not a question on which it is necessary for this Commission to express an opinion. In the event of a revision being ultimately decided upon, the State Governments may be able to meet the extra cost involved in the introduction of uniform scales of pay by retrenchment and administrative rationalisation to some extent, but, too much reliance cannot be placed on these possibilities in the initial years after reorganisation. In the light of the experience of the working of some of the Part B States, a reduction in the number of districts and other administrative units or large-scale, retrenchment, even if justified on administrative grounds, would appear to be a remote possibility. Retrenchment and rationalisation will have to be spread, in all probability, over a number of years; the extra cost of salary revisions will, therefore, be fairly heavy.

103. One other major consequence of reorganisation will probably be the upsetting of the work of the Delimitation Commission. Much of the work of the delimitation of constituencies will have to be done all over again, and major amendments will clearly be needed in the Representation of the People Act, 1950.

104. This discussion is not, and cannot be, exhaustive. It does not take into account, for example, what may be called the human factor, which should be a relevant consideration in breaking up old associations and alignments, or the fact that the service personnel allotted to a State may be inadequately equipped to deal with the needs of that State. There will also be many other minor difficulties with which the new States may be faced. The division of assets and liabilities has never proved to be easy. What are known as unique institutions, that is to say, institutions which serve the needs of the State as a whole, may not be equitably divided on partition; arrangements may have to be made to duplicate them or to ensure that they serve the separated units. Separation of records would involve a

process of sifting, collating and large-scale copying. Some changes in the judicial organisation of the States, will also be necessary, and considerable volume of accounts work will be created at a time when the Comptroller and Auditor-General is planning an experiment in the separation of accounts and audit, which will itself add greatly to the responsibility of State Governments.

105. The Integration of princely States involved administrative Changes in an area of about 360,000 square miles inhabited by about 59 million people - not counting the major and minor units the boundaries of which were not changed. Impressive as the scale and swiftness of these changes were, it can now be seen in retrospect that the process of rationalising the administrative system in these areas has been spread over seven or eight years and, as has been stated already, it is still not complete. If the reorganisation of States at the present time is to be on a comparable scale, the effects of the change are bound to be considerable.

106. A preliminary but essential consideration to bear in mind, therefore, is that no change should be made unless it is a distinct improvement in the existing position and unless the advantages which result from it, in terms of the promotion of "the welfare of the people of each constituent unit, as well as the nation as a whole" - the objectives set before the Commission by the Government of India-are such as to compensate for the heavy burden on the administrative and financial resources of the country which reorganisation of the existing units must entail. The reorganisation of States has to be regarded as a means to an end and not an end in itself; that being the case, it is quite legitimate to consider whether there is on the whole a balance of advantage in any change.

CHAPTER II. UNITY AND SECURITY OF INDIA

107. The first essential objective of any

scheme of reorganisation must be the unity and security of India. Any movement which may tend to impair the unity of the country must 'ultimately affect the welfare of all sections of the Indian people. Any measure of reorganisation which is likely to create tensions and disharmony must weaken the sense of unity among the people of India and should not, therefore, be countenanced.

108. While it is generally agreed that the unity of India must be regarded as the prime factor in readjusting territories, there has been considerable difference of opinion as to how this objective is to be realised. Basically, the difference of approach arises from the measure of emphasis put on the relative suitability, in the conditions prevailing in the country of federal and unitary concepts, not merely as the basic postulates underlying the constitutional structure of India, but as embracing concepts covering the political as well as the social and cultural life of the people. The problem is essentially one of determining how far the free play of provincial sentiment deriving from a consciousness of cultural and linguistic distinctiveness is a factor making for unity or disunity.

109. One view is that:

- (a) it will be unrealistic to disregard the patent fact that there are in India distinct cultural units; the unity of the country, therefore, should not be sought in terms of an imposed external unity but a fundamental unity recognising diversity of language, culture and tradition of the Indian people;
- (b) the strength of the Indian Union must be the strength . which it derives from its constituent units; and
- (c) since the unity and strength within the constituent units is a condition precedent to a healthy feeling of unity at the national level, any attempt to eliminate tensions and contradictions and to make units more homogeneous and internally cohesive is bound to strengthen the unity of the whole nation.

110. The other view is that:

- (a) in the past India did not achieve a real measure of political unification or develop into a living body, social or political, constituting an integrated whole; if, therefore, we have to create a united India, it must be based on a new concept of unity which cannot be achieved by reaffirmation or re-enunciation of old values such as religion, community, culture and language, which operate more to separate than to unite;
- (b) regional consciousness never contributed to India's oneness in the past. In fact, it is inherent in narrower loyalties, whether based on communal, provincial or linguistic considerations, that they ally themselves with centrifugal forces and become instruments of inter-state discord and other disruptive trends. The idea of sub-nations or nationalities, which must foment resistance to the growth of national unity, is implicit in the demand for a reorganisation of States or a rectification of their boundaries, on the basis of exclusivist factors such as linguistic and cultural homogeneity; and
- (c) if, therefore, the unity of India has to develop into a dynamic concept capable of welding the nation together, it must transcend community and language and recognise the entire nation as one integrated unit.

111. In the Chapter dealing with the implications of the linguistic principle we have examined at some length the question of finding an equilibrium between the regional sentiment and the national spirit. Here we shall briefly indicate the basic considerations which should govern our approach to the problem:

- (i) an essential feature of our social fabric is undoubtedly a wide variation in our life within the framework of a broadly united culture. This, however, does not mean that diversity is a pre-requisite of unity or that overemphasis on diversity will not hamper the growth of the national sentiment;

- (ii) in a vast country like ours, governed by a federal Constitution, centrifugal forces are not an unnatural phenomenon, but what is important is not that they should be eliminated, but that such forces must not be allowed to impede the achievement of our national, unity; and
- (iii) the strength of the nation is undoubtedly the sum total of the combined strength of the people of the component States. But while the building of contented units, strong enough to bear their share of the burden, is an important objective, it is no less necessary that the links between the units and the nation should be equally strong so that under the stress of regional loyalties, the Union does not fall apart.

112. It follows that, while internal adjustments at State level are to be desired, it is imperative to ensure that these do not lead to maladjustments at the inter-state and national level. From the point of view of national unity, therefore, reorganisation has to aim at a two-fold objective:

- (a) firm discouragement of disruptive sentiments such as provincialism or linguistic fanaticism; and
- (b) consistent with national solidarity, provision of full scope for the unhampered growth of the genius of each group of people.

This requires that we must build the administrative and political structure of the country on the basic concept of the primacy of the nation, conceding to lesser units an autonomous existence and an intrinsic life and purpose of their own, but only within the harmoniously integrated organism of Indian nationhood.

National Security

113. A fundamental pre-requisite of national security is the unity of the country. What promotes unity, therefore, also strengthens security.

Other considerations which we have to keep in mind from the point of view of national security are:

- (i) it is of great importance that the composition of administrative units, should not assume a form which might foster regional, communal or other narrower loyalties in, any section of the armed forces of India and thereby undermine their undivided allegiance to the Union of India;
- (ii) in strategic areas where effective or direct central control is necessary, the administrative structure as also the measure of autonomy given to the people, should be governed by considerations of national security; and
- (iii) another factor relevant from the point of view of national security is the size and resources of the border States. While the primary responsibility for defence arrangements must be that of the Central Government, a considerable burden relating to security arrangements must be borne by the State. It is, therefore, important that a border State should be a well-administered, stable and resourceful unit, capable of meeting the emergent problems arising out of military exigencies. This means that normally it would be safer to have on our borders relatively larger and resourceful States rather than small and less resilient units.

114. It may be desirable to elaborate the last-mentioned point a little further. It has been argued in some important memoranda that the formation of the separate North-West Frontier Province in 1901 involved the recognition of the principle that, for defence purposes, a small province on the border is preferable to a large one. This view is based on an incorrect appreciation of the reasons for the detachment of the frontier districts from the Punjab to form a separate Chief Commissioner's province.

115. The main consideration underlying the detachment of the frontier region in 1901 was the establishment of direct central control over it in preference to control through the medium of "a Local Government of the first class". In fact, when the proposal to establish the North-West Frontier Province was approved, the Secretary of State for India recounted the advantages of a strong administration on the frontier and pointed out that the existing arrangements had been found unsatisfactory and that the assumption of direct central control over the frontier areas had become essential. He said:

"In remarking that the need of a strong administration equipped with all the resources of Government would be felt on the frontier, I did not refer to the political administration. I referred to the advantages that must accrue to the frontier districts of British India from the application to them of the ways and means at the command of a first-class administrative unit. The construction of roads, bridges, rest houses, and hospitals, and generally the assignment of provincial resources to a particular district, may be of the utmost value, and are best secured if the district is an integral part of a large province. In times of disturbance or threatened danger a larger province can draft in additional police, procure transport, change local officers, and do much to prepare for troubles before they arise or assume the form of Military operations".

116. This puts succinctly the case for larger States on the frontier. It seems clear to us that, when a border area is not under the direct control of the Centre, small units and multiplicity of jurisdictions would be an obvious handicap from the point of view of national security.

CHAPTER III. LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

117. The question that has caused the greatest controversy is the position to be accorded to language in the reorganisation of the States of the Indian Union. One of the major facts of India's political evolution during the last hundred years has been the growth of our regional languages. They have during this period developed into rich and powerful vehicles of expression creating a sense of unity among the peoples speaking them. In view of the fact that these languages are spoken in well-defined areas, often with a historic background, the demand for the unification of such areas to form separate States has gathered momentum and has, in some cases, assumed the form of an immediate political programme. The Resolution appointing this Commission makes a specific reference to the importance of language. A careful examination of the pros and cons of this problem is, therefore, necessary as an essential preliminary to the consideration of the question of the reorganisation of States.

The case for Linguistic States

118. The advocates of a rigid and uniform application of the linguistic principle in determining the boundaries of States advance important arguments- in support of their claim which may be briefly stated and examined here.

119. A federal union, such as ours, presupposes that the units are something more than mere creatures of administrative convenience. The constituent States in a federal republic must each possess a minimum degree of homogeneity to ensure the emotional response which is necessary for the working of democratic institutions. The States of the Indian Union can achieve this internal cohesiveness only if they are constituted on a unilingual basis, because language being the vehicle for the communion of thought and feeling provides the most effective single bond for uniting the people. Linguistic homogeneity, therefore, provides the only rational basis for

reconstructing the States, for it reflects the social and cultural pattern of living obtaining in well-defined regions of the country.

120. In a democracy such as we have in India, based on universal adult franchise, the political and administrative work of a State has of necessity to be conducted in the regional language. A multiplicity of such languages would lead to weakness and inefficiency in administration and rivalry and jealousy in politics. It is pointed out that already in some of the States a large percentage of members in the legislature know only one language and this trend is likely to become more and more emphasised. In some States even ministers know only one regional language. Discussions in legislatures would become difficult, if a considerable number of members are unable to follow the proceedings.

121. Under an alien rule the basic need of unity of outlook between the people and those governing them could be subordinated to imperial and other considerations. But under a democratic form of government based on adult franchise, it is imperative that there should be a real consciousness of identity of interests between the people and the government, and that both should work in an atmosphere of co-ordination and mutual understanding. The success of a welfare state depends essentially on broad-based popular support, which cannot be secured if the processes of government are not brought home to the people. If the Legislature of a State is not to develop into a babel of tongues, it must conduct its work in one language, the language of the people. The various devices adopted in multi-lingual States to meet the communicational needs of the people have led only to a dissipation of energy and national resources.

122. Educational activity can be stimulated only by giving the regional languages their due place. If the educated few are not to be isolated