

CHAPTER II

BACKGROUND OF THE DISPUTES

Before making any recommendations on the individual disputes between the States of Maharashtra and Mysore, it is apposite to give the background of these disputes.

2.2. On 10th August, 1953, a Bill was introduced in the House of the People to provide for the formation of the Andhra State. This was a province which approximated as much as possible to a linguistic province and it came into existence on the 1st October, 1953.

2.3. 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 reorganisation 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 the States Reorganisation Commission under a Resolution of the Government of India in the Ministry of Home Affairs dated 29th December, 1953. The task of the Commission was set out in para 7 of the Resolution:

"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."

2.4. The States Reorganisation Commission took up the task of redrawing the political map of India in the hope that the changes which were to be brought about will give satisfaction to the substantial majority of the Indian people.

2.5. In the Resolution of the Government of India some broad principles were indicated which would govern the problem of reorganisation of States. It was said therein:

"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."

2.6. The States Reorganisation Commission formulated four principles on the basis of which they intended to investigate the problem:

- (i) preservation and strengthening of the unity and security of India;

- (ii) linguistic and cultural homogeneity;
- (iii) financial, economic and administrative considerations; and
- (iv) successful working of the national plan

2.7. It was observed that the reorganisation of States had to be regarded as a means to an end and not an end by itself and that it will be quite legitimate to consider whether there is on the whole a balance of advantage in any change. 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. A balanced approach to the problem appears to be to recognize linguistic homogeneity as an important factor conducive to administrative convenience and efficiency but not to consider it as an exclusive and binding principle, overriding all other considerations, administrative, financial or political; and to ensure that communicational, educational and cultural needs of different language groups are adequately safeguarded; to repudiate the "home land" concept; and also to reject the theory of "one language one State" which is not justified on grounds of linguistic homogeneity, because there can be more than one State speaking the same language without offending the linguistic principle.

2.8. In Part III, Chapter III, the Commission dealt with the formation of the State of Kerala and it said that there was little justification for the Kerala claim to the whole of the South Kanara district. The Dar Commission had included only the Kasaragod taluka of South Kanara in the geographically contiguous area in which the Malayalam language was largely spoken. As a result of the resorting of Census slips, the language figures for this taluka were available. According to these figures, the Malayalam-speaking percentage is about 72. Though Kannadiga opinion in South Kanara concedes the claim of Kerala up to the Chandragiri river, administratively it would be more expedient to join the whole taluka to Kerala than to break it up purely on linguistic grounds.

2.9. The formation of the State of Karnatak was dealt with in Part III, Chapter IV, and it was said that as it had been generally recognised that in the provincial distribution under the British, the Kannadigas suffered most with their area split up into four units in three of which they were at the tail-end and reduced to the position of ineffective minorities. The All-India Congress Committee in 1927, the All-Parties Conference in 1928 and the Indian Statutory Commission in 1930 all recognized the legitimacy of the claim of the Kannadigas to unification. The State was thus comprised of—

- (a) the present Mysore State, excluding the portions of the Bellary district as now constituted, namely, the Siruguppa taluka, the Bellary taluka, the Hospet taluka and a small area of the Mallapuram sub-taluka in which the dam and the headquarters of the Tungabhadra project are situated;
- (b) the four Kannada-speaking districts of the southern division of Bombay, namely, Belgaum except for Chandgad taluka, Bijapur, Dharwar and North Kanara;

- (c) the districts of Raichur and Gulbarga;
- (d) the South Kanara district except the Kasaragod taluka;
- (e) the Kollegal taluka of the Coimbatore district of Madras; and
- (f) Coorg.

2.10. It was observed that the territorial limits of Karnatak broadly covered the Kannada-speaking areas, but in the case of one or two small units, linguistic considerations were subordinated to other compelling reasons.

2.11. The compelling reasons were stated in para 332 in the following terms:

"It seems that Shri Justice Misra was mainly guided by what he described as "linguistic gravity" although he took other considerations also into account. On the other hand, we have to be guided by certain principles which can be generally applied. The retention of Kolar district in the Karnataka State and the addition of the major part of Belgaum district to it will, in our opinion, be more advantageous to the new State than the continuance in it of the eastern portion of the Bellary district."

2.12. It was further said that the "linguistic consideration only should not, in our view, be the decisive factor, especially in setting the future of a border tract which cannot be regarded as predominantly unilingual. What has weighed with us in arriving at the conclusion to which we have referred is the cumulative effect of three main considerations, namely, administrative convenience, economic links and the importance of the Tungabhadra project to the Rayalaseema district of Andhra."

2.13. The Chandgad taluka of Belgaum district is predominantly Marathi-speaking and it was established as a result of the resorting of Census slips that the Marathi majority in the taluka was as big as 92.4 per cent. It could *conveniently be administered by the State of Bombay*, and Karnatak should have no objection to this proposal.

2.14. As regards the remaining ten talukas of Belgaum district, it was claimed that two of them, Khanapur and Belgaum (including Belgaum town) as well as portions of Chikodi taluka, had closer affiliations with the Marathi-speaking districts of Bombay than with the adjoining areas in the proposed Karnatak State. The Marathi majorities in Khanapur and Belgaum talukas were slight: being 53.9 and 51.4 respectively. Six out of the remaining seven talukas were predominantly Kannada-speaking, and in the seventh, namely, Chikodi, the Kannadigas constituted the largest single language group. All the talukas of Belgaum district have economic relations with both the Marathi as well as the Kannada-speaking areas. The Belgaum town is the centre of the transit trade in this area, which is chiefly in cotton and oilseeds. Neither the Belgaum town nor the other disputed areas have any particularly marked economic

affiliations with the Marathi-speaking districts of Bombay. There was no case, therefore, for detaching either Khanapur or Belgaum or portions of Chikodi from the rest of the Belgaum district.

2.15. It was argued that Belgaum town has an absolute Marathi majority and due consideration should be given to this factor. Separate mother tongue figures for this town were not compiled during the last census. In the past, however, for a variety of reasons, it attracted a steady stream of immigrants from many areas. Even if it is admitted that this town has now a Marathi majority, in view of the very slight Marathi majority in the taluka of Belgaum and the fact that economic relations are not particularly marked with any linguistic area, the future both of the taluka as well as of the town should more properly be decided on administrative grounds. If as many as nine out of the eleven talukas go to Karnataka (Chandgad going to Bombay and Belgaum being disputed) then, on administrative grounds, the Belgaum town, which is the district headquarters, along with the Belgaum taluka, should also go to Karnataka. The Bellary town along with Bellary taluka has been allocated to Andhra, although the town, according to Shri Justice Misra's report, did not have a predominantly Andhra complexion. Similarly the Belgaum town should go to Karnataka.

2.16. The State of Bombay was comprised of the existing Bombay State minus the Abu Road taluka of Banaskantha district, the Karnataka districts of Dharwar, Bijapur, North Kanara and the district of Belgaum (except the Chandgad taluka), plus the areas of Osmanabad, Bhir, Aurangabad, Parbhani and Nanded districts of the Hyderabad State, Saurashtra and Kutch.

2.17. The States Reorganisation Act, 1956 (Act No. XXXVII of 1956), was passed by the Parliament that year. During the pendency of the Bill in Parliament a number of amendments and readjustments of various territorial boundaries were suggested but almost all of them except regarding Bellary were rejected. Bellary area was allotted to Karnataka. The Home Minister declared on more than one occasion that there were still differences of opinion regarding various territorial adjustments and that he would prefer any such readjustment of territories lying on the common borders of the States to be deferred for consideration and settlement by the Zonal Councils, which bodies had been authorised specifically to deal with such boundary matters.

2.18. In the year 1957, the Government of Bombay submitted a memorandum to the Ministry of Home Affairs suggesting readjustment of border areas between Bombay and Mysore States. It was stated in this memorandum that while the States Reorganisation Act, 1956, settled in the highest democratic forum of the country, the main framework of the reorganisation of States, a large number of marginal territorial adjustments still remained to be considered. Parliament provided a machinery in the shape of the Zonal Councils specifically for the consideration of such boundary matters and for consequential readjustments of territories. It was contended that so far as the demarcation between the Marathi-speaking and

Kannada-speaking areas along the common boundaries of the Bombay and Mysore States was concerned, the decisive factor unquestionably has been the principle of linguistic homogeneity. It was observed that any territorial ambition *per se* on the part of any State would be totally inapposite as well as improper in the present context, as every State is an integral part of the Union of India. It was further said that any such readjustment of boundaries would in any case involve only marginal territorial gains or losses. The issue had to be considered from the point of view of the greatest convenience of the populations affected rather than from the viewpoint whether more or less area of territory would be acquired or lost on balance by a particular State. It was stated that it was in this spirit of accommodation and entirely with a view to serve the better convenience and interest of the largest number of the affected people of both language groups along the borders of the two States, and not for the purpose of any territorial aggrandizement, that the Government of Bombay approached this issue. It would be desirable *prima facie* to make such territorial adjustments as would minimise to the farthest possible extent the numbers of persons along the border, who would be incommoded by being left out on the other side of the administrative frontier comprising the main body of its linguistic group.

2.19. In para 7 of its memorandum, the Government of Bombay stated—

“The States Reorganisation Commission no doubt desired to confine themselves to the ‘district’ as a unit whilst setting out the broad outline of linguistic reorganisation. This consideration, while no doubt relevant for arriving at the first view of the main framework of distribution of areas among States, is not sufficiently specific and accurate when it comes to the actual demarcation of boundaries between two States where the demarcation purports to be on the linguistic principle. In fact, in its proposals for demarcation of boundaries, the States Reorganisation Commission itself found it necessary to go to a level much below that of the district. In the territorial changes in the formation of new States, Parliament has had to go down to the level of the taluka and indeed in some cases even to the level of the circle.”

2.20. An important point for consideration is that the district does not necessarily furnish a dependable unit of geographical or organic unity. Large parts of the present territory of the district of Belgaum, for instance, were parts first of the district of Bellary in Madras Presidency and later, of a much larger district of Dharwar in the earlier days of British rule. More recently, since 1949, owing to the merger of States in the Southern Maratha county, whose territories were greatly mixed up in this area, a population of some 5 lakhs was added to the population of Belgaum district together with an accession of a thousand square miles of its area. It would appear that equally the ‘taluka’ would fail to furnish a measure of stable organic unity just like the district.

2.21. While the village might be taken as the unit for purposes of demarcation of boundaries, for obvious reasons such demarcation could only be in respect of contiguous territory. Obviously, no 'islands' or 'corridors' could be allowed to be created while undertaking such readjustment of boundaries. There may have to be exceptions to the general principle of linguistic demarcation by the village. Every such exception will have to be considered on the merits of each individual case and established before it is accepted.

2.22. The general position was summarised as follows:

"The demarcation of boundary between the State of Bombay and the State of Mysore having been in the main linguistic, for the readjustment of territories along the border the guiding principle must be that of linguistic homogeneity. It is the obvious duty of those in whom the appropriate authority is reposed, to demarcate this boundary so as to leave the problem of linguistic minorities in its smallest size. For the purpose of such demarcation neither the 'district' nor the 'taluka' nor the 'circle' would provide a dependable organic entity and that we must be prepared ultimately to fall back when necessary on the primary unit of habitation, namely, a village. For obvious reasons such demarcation can be in respect of only contiguous territory without leaving 'islands' and 'corridors'. While the initial presumption would lie in favour of a readjustment of territories bringing the largest number of people speaking a particular language within the frontiers of the State comprising the major linguistic group, such a presumption may be rebutted if sufficiently strong factors point to the contrary in a particular case. These factors would include considerations of geographical unity, economic affiliation or administrative convenience."

2.23. It was submitted that the proposals for readjustment of boundaries were entirely tentative and were intended merely to illustrate how such readjustment would redound to the benefit of both the language groups and to indicate the order of size of the population involved in such readjustment. This tentative demarcation had been made having in view exclusively the consideration of linguistic contiguity. Circumstances may exist where the initial presumption may be rebutted by other cogent considerations such as communications, economic affiliation, administrative requirements, etc.

2.24. The States Reorganisation Commission added the taluka of Chandgad to the State of Bombay, Marathi-speaking population being 92.4 per cent. In the adjoining Belgaum and Khanapur talukas, the Marathi-speaking population outnumbers the Kannada-speaking population, being 49.8 per cent and 54.3 per cent as against 35.5 per cent and 34.5 per cent respectively. In the Chikodi taluka the Marathi-speaking population is 42.1 per cent as against the Kannada-speaking population, which is 49.3 per cent. However, the Marathi-speaking population is concentrated in the western part of the taluka which is contiguous with Kolhapur district and the rest

of the Marathi-speaking tract. According to the line of demarcation drawn up by the Government of Bombay, 2,89,878 Marathi-speaking population would be rejoined to the contiguous mainland of the Marathi-speaking area. In certain other small areas of the talukas of Hukeri and Athni in Belgaum district, there are a number of villages contiguous with the Marathi-speaking area, with a Marathi-speaking majority.

2.25. In this memorandum it was said that it was a disputed question between linguists whether Konkani should be regarded as a dialect of Marathi or as an independent language originating from the common Prakrit, the progenitor of both. However, there is no dispute that in its structure as well as vocabulary, this language is closely affiliated with Marathi.

2.26. In the Akkalkot, South Sholapur and Mangalwedha talukas of Sholapur district, in Jath taluka of South Satara district and in Shirol and Gadhinglaj talukas of Kolhapur district, there were compact areas wherein there was a preponderance of the Kannada-speaking people as against the Marathi-speaking people. In Akkalkot taluka 23.3 per cent speak Marathi as against 55.5 per cent who speak Kannada. In South Sholapur taluka 32.2 per cent speak Marathi as against 48.1 per cent speaking Kannada. In Mangalwedha taluka 79 per cent speak Marathi and 13.8 per cent Kannada. In Jath taluka 52 per cent speak Marathi and 40.2 per cent speak Kannada. In Shirol taluka, while 50.6 per cent speak Marathi, 36.0 per cent speak Kannada. In Gadhinglaj taluka the percentage of Marathi and Kannada speakers is 61.1 and 32.3 respectively. As in the case of Belgaum areas, here also the Bombay Government suggested that the demarcation between Bombay and Mysore States should be reviewed and the boundaries adjusted so as to transfer to the Mysore State contiguous Kannada-speaking areas.

2.27. In three talukas of Bidar district of the former Hyderabad State, viz., Humnabad, Bhalki and Santpur, there was a substantial proportion of Marathi-speaking people. These talukas which stand included in Bidar district of the new Mysore State lie immediately to the east and south-east of Udgir and Nilanga talukas and the Marathi-speaking population is concentrated mainly in the western parts of the talukas, adjoining Bombay State.

2.28. In the 28 villages of Humnabad taluka, tentatively demarcated, Marathi-speaking population is 63 per cent and Kannada-speaking 16 per cent. In the 49 villages of Bhalki taluka, Marathi-speaking population is 59 per cent and Kannada-speaking 30 per cent. In the 69 villages of Santpur taluka, Marathi population is 60 per cent and Kannada 26 per cent. In Aland taluka of Gulbarga district there is a small compact area wherein there is a preponderance of Marathi-speaking people as against the Kannada-speaking people. This area lies to the immediate south of Omerga taluka of Osmanabad district, which forms part of the new Bombay State. The population of the villages in this area is 4,978 of which 3,356 speak Marathi.

2.29. Claim was made in the taluka of Belgaum for 84 villages, the total population of which was 2,20,389, the linguistic percentage being 61 per cent Marathi-speaking.

2.30. In Khanapur taluka claim was made for 206 villages having a population of 68,522 with 77 per cent Marathi-speaking.

2.31. In the Athni taluka 10 villages were claimed with a population of 20,858, Marathi-speaking percentage being 61.

2.32. In the Chikodi taluka of Belgaum district 41 villages having a population of 1,07,856 were claimed, the percentage of Marathi-speaking being 73.

2.33. In Hukeri taluka 18 villages were claimed with a population of 15,094, Marathi-speaking percentage being 80.

2.34. In the district of North Kanara, in Karwar taluka, 50 villages were claimed with a population of 67,107, Marathi and Konkani speaking population being 78 per cent.

2.35. In Supa taluka of North Kanara district 131 villages were claimed with a population of 17,451, Marathi and Konkani speaking being 84 per cent.

2.36. In Haliyal taluka of North Kanara district 120 villages were claimed with a population of 31,122, Marathi and Konkani speaking being 67 per cent.

2.37. In Bidar district in Humnabad taluka 28 villages were claimed with a population of 22,303, Marathi-speaking being 63 per cent. In Bhalki taluka of Bidar district 49 villages with a population of 47,879 were claimed, Marathi-speaking being 59 per cent. In Santpur taluka of Bidar district 69 villages with a population of 46,689 were claimed, Marathi-speaking being 60 per cent.

2.38. In Gulbarga district in Aland taluka 8 villages were claimed with a population of 4,978 Marathi-speaking being 68 per cent.

2.39. The following villages were suggested to be joined to the Mysore State:

- (1) In Sholapur district in South Sholapur taluka 65 villages with a population of 74,679, Kannada-speaking being 57 per cent.
- (2) In Mangalwedha taluka of Sholapur district 9 villages with a population of 8,479, Kannada-speaking being 62 per cent.
- (3) In Akkalkot taluka of Sholapur district 99 villages with a population of 1,06,403, Kannada-speaking being 68 per cent.
- (4) In Jath taluka of South Satara district 44 villages with a population of 51,863, Kannada-speaking being 72 per cent.

- (5) In Shirol taluka of Kolhapur district 19 villages with a population of 46,807, Kannada-speaking being 52 per cent.
- (6) In Gadhinglaj taluka of Kolhapur district 24 villages with a population of 37,029, Kannada-speaking being 67 per cent.

2.40. In the result 260 villages with a population of 3,25,260 were suggested to be transferred to the State of Mysore from the State of Bombay while 814 villages with a population of 6,70,228 were claimed by the State of Bombay from the State of Mysore.

2.41. The Government of Mysore reacted adversely to the claim made by the Government of Bombay. It, however, admitted that the Zonal Councils had been authorised to deal with all these boundary matters and for readjustment of territories lying on the common borders of the States. What was contemplated was a settlement of minor disputes and not of those of a major character. It said that the Government of Bombay had made an attempt to raise the very disputes which were placed before the Lok Sabha and were rejected either summarily or by a majority of votes. The Lok Sabha in clear terms rejected the principle of demarcation on the ground of linguistic majority and village as a unit. The States Reorganisation Commission was not prepared to transfer any area on the basis of less than a district and for overwhelming reasons an area comprising a taluka. It was also said that no change could be made where the percentage of the people speaking any language was below 70 per cent. The demand for Karwar, Haliyal and Supa talukas was also considered by the Lok Sabha and was summarily rejected. A clause was sought to be inserted in the proposed Act regarding the areas of the Belgaum district. This clause was in these terms:

“that Khanapur taluka and predominantly Marathi-speaking areas of Belgaum taluka to be determined by a Boundary Commission, and the Nipani Bhag of Chikodi taluka, or alternatively the predominantly Marathi-speaking villages contiguous to Maharashtra State in Athni and Hukeri talukas to be determined by a Boundary Commission be included in Maharashtra.”

This amendment was also rejected by the House.

2.42. A strong stand was taken by the Government of Mysore, which stand with great determination they took before the Commission, that the States Reorganisation Commission consisting of three eminent men of our country who after considering the various claims had submitted their report which had been with certain exceptions accepted by the Parliament, had concluded the question of disputes raised by the Government of Bombay and contended that *status quo* should be maintained and there was no ground to alter the existing borders. They repeatedly drew the Commission's attention to the observations of the States Reorganisation Commission, that they did not regard the linguistic principle as the sole criterion for territorial readjustments, particularly in the areas where the majority commanded by a language group was only marginal. Atten-

tion was drawn to the remarks of the Dar Commission that it would not be proper to describe any area as unilingual unless the majority of one language spoken in that area was at least 70 per cent and that any area below that should be considered as bilingual or multilingual. The S.R. Commission was in agreement with that view and said that the mere fact that a certain language group had a substantial majority in a certain area should not be the sole deciding factor.

2.43. The Government of Mysore contended that the memorandum of the Government of Bombay involved changes in boundaries over a length of nearly 500 miles from Santpur taluka in the north-east to Karwar in the west of the Mysore State and the entire northern boundary of the State was proposed to be redrawn by pushing the existing boundaries, in certain places further south by 120 miles. The proposals involved the transfer of more than a thousand villages between the two States along a stretch of 400 to 500 miles in a belt, as wide as 150 miles in certain places. It, however, suggested that an adjustment might be possible if the Government of Maharashtra were prepared to restrict its claim to minor boundary adjustments within a ten-mile belt on either side of the existing boundary line.

2.44. The suggestion of the Bombay Government that the dispute should be settled by adopting the Pataskar Formula, which was evolved by mutual agreement of the States of Madras and Andhra had no application for settlement of the disputes now raised. The Government of Mysore further contended that in 1929 at the time of the Marathi Literary Conference held at Belgaum great leaders of Maharashtra including Shri N. C. Kelkar unequivocally recognised that Belgaum was part of Karnatak. It asserted that historically Belgaum district had always been part of the Kannada region.

2.45. Reference was made to the Census of the year 1901 wherein it was said that 65 per cent of the people of Belgaum district spoke Kannada and only 25 per cent of the total population spoke Marathi. It was suggested that the figures of 1951 Census were not quite reliable. In the result all the claims made by the Government of Bombay were individually repudiated for reasons stated above.

2.46. The contention of the Government of Bombay that Konkani was a dialect of Marathi was repudiated and it was claimed that it was an independent language.

2.47. As regards Bidar district, it was said that the Bidar District Congress Committee unanimously requested the Government of Hyderabad to recommend the inclusion of three talukas of Bhalki, Humnabad and Santpur in Mysore State and retain Bidar as a district, if necessary by the inclusion of certain adjoining areas from the district of Gulbarga. The Hyderabad Legislative Assembly when it discussed the States Reorganisation Bill unanimously agreed for the inclusion of these talukas in the State of Mysore. The Chief Minister of Hyderabad in a letter dated 3rd May, 1956, to the Home Minister of the Government of India said that there was agreement amongst all the members about the allotment of different

areas to the three States of Maharashtra, Mysore and Andhra Pradesh. This unanimous decision of the Hyderabad Assembly got the approval of the Parliament.

2.48. In order to settle the dispute raised on 25th June, 1957, the Government of Bombay requested that its proposals be placed before the Zonal Council very early. The Zonal Council was unable to decide the matter before the two States of Maharashtra and Gujarat were formed and a new Western Zone came into existence and the Mysore State was taken out of the Western Zone and included in the Southern Zone. At the instance of the Home Minister of the Government of India, Shri G. B. Pant, it was agreed that the dispute concerning the boundary between these two States should be referred to a Four-Man Committee by the Chief Ministers of Maharashtra and Mysore.

2.49. On 5th June, 1960, the two Chief Ministers made an announcement that it was agreed that the Government of Maharashtra and the Government of Mysore would each appoint two representatives. These four representatives would study and discuss together in detail the cases put forward by the two Governments regarding the disputed border between the two States and report to the two Governments to what extent there was agreement and disagreement about the disputed border with reasons therefor.

2.50. On 30th November, 1960, Shri H. V. Pataskar and Shri M. D. Bhat were nominated by Shri Y. B. Chavan, Chief Minister, Maharashtra, as the two representatives of that Government on the Four-Man Committee. Shri S. Channiah and Shri S. S. Malimath were nominated by Shri B. D. Jatti, Chief Minister, Mysore, as the two representatives of the Government of Mysore on the Four-Man Committee.

2.51. This Committee started functioning on the 23rd January, 1961. It held several meetings at different places. The sixth meeting of the Committee was held in Bombay on 1st and 2nd January, 1962. At this meeting certain issues were framed and discussed. Opinions of each member in respect of each of the issues were recorded. It may be mentioned here that Shri Pataskar asserted under one of the issues that an absolute majority of a language group in a village or a relative majority of a linguistic group should be the criterion for settling the dispute. The representatives of the Mysore Government sharply reacted adversely to this proposition. The only agreement between the four members of the Committee was on the issue of contiguity. On all other matters they differed and separate reports were submitted by the representatives of the two Governments without arriving at any agreement. The result was that this Committee in spite of all its labours for about two years failed to solve the problem. The Pataskar Committee allowed the claim of the Maharashtra State in full and the Mysore members rejected it *in toto*. They were definitely of the opinion that there was no ground whatsoever for disturbing the *status quo* and changing the border line drawn up by the States Reorganisation Commission after a careful study of the problem and upheld by

Parliament. The Mysore members were, however, prepared to make boundary adjustments in minor matters and within ten miles of the borders of the two States, but they did not indicate the exact line of such demarcation.

252. The Maharashtra members of the Four-Man Committee made an observation which has some significance. They said that the dispute is not so much about the 1,958 villages or the 13 smaller townships as about the three cities of Belgaum, Karwar and Nipani, and of these three, the most important is the city of Belgaum. When the author of the Report was interviewed by me, I put it to him whether the logical inference from this observation was not that the Government of Maharashtra would be satisfied if they got the city of Belgaum and would not press their dispute about the villages. He candidly said that that inference was possible, but that was not his intention while making those observations.

253. Reference was made in the Mysore members report to the Prime Minister's statement in Parliament whereon he said that he did not suppose that the most ideal solutions whatever they might have been, could possibly have been pleasing to everybody.

254. Language no doubt is a cementing factor and may bring about harmony, unity and solidarity among the people concerned but it is also likely that it may create exclusivism, if not encourage a spirit of intolerance against other languages. This leads to aggressiveness and expansionism resulting in a sense of irredentism. The crying need of India today is national integration. We have to get rid of such parochialism as communalism, regionalism and the like and foster a feeling of co-operation, unity and strengthen the integrity of the nation.

255. It would not be proper to fix general principles. Formulating certain fixed principles for rigid application would create more difficulties in the way than offer a solution to the problem.

256. It was said by the Mysore members that the dispute should be settled by fixing taluka as a unit.

257. With regard to the offer of the Government of Maharashtra for transferring certain areas where the Kannada-speaking people were in a majority to the Mysore State, the two members of the Mysore Government seemed to agree to the transfer of 24 villages in the Gadhinglaj taluka of Kolhapur district. They also seemed to agree to accept the offer of the Maharashtra Government regarding Shirol taluka of the Kolhapur district suggesting 19 villages to be transferred to Mysore. As regards Jath taluka of the district of Sangli or South Satara, the Government of Maharashtra conceded that 44 villages having Kannada majority might be transferred to Mysore. This offer seems to have the implied assent of the members of the Committee. It was said that the portions marked out by the Government of Maharashtra as Kannada areas of Sholapur district come from three talukas, viz., Mangalwedha, South Sholapur and Akkalkot. It was contended before the Committee that the taluka

of Sholapur was divided into two with the idea that when provinces came to be formed on linguistic basis, the Kannada villages which were bound^b to go to Karnatak might be marked into a separate taluka and that by thus dividing the taluka the city of Sholapur at least should be saved by separating it from the clearly Kannada areas and putting it in North Sholapur taluka and that close on edge of Sholapur city were Kannada majority areas both to the south and to the east of it. The members of the Committee, however, felt that they were not concerned with the allegations made before them.

2.58. In Mangalwedha taluka the offer was for 9 villages to be transferred to Mysore. Sixty-five villages in the South Sholapur taluka were offered by Maharashtra to Mysore. The offer was quietly accepted with the suggestion that if the theory of kinship of language was applied, as relied upon by the Government of Maharashtra elsewhere, Telugu had greater affinity with Kannada than Marathi and if the people speaking these two languages were added together, they would form a clear majority in Sholapur city. In this state of affairs, it appears possible that Sholapur city may as well be linked to South Sholapur than to North Sholapur taluka.

2.59. The Government of Maharashtra conceded that 99 villages with an area of 436.9 sq. miles and a population of 1,06,403 deserve to be transferred from Akkalkot taluka to Mysore State. The two members of the Four-Man Committee representing Mysore were of the view that the area of the State of Akkalkot will have to be treated as a unit for the purpose of allocation of the area to a particular linguistic State. Out of the 121 villages and 3 towns in the present Akkalkot taluka, 101 villages belonged to the State of Akkalkot, 15 villages to the State of Kurundwad and 5 villages were from the original South Sholapur taluka. So these 5 villages do not adjoin any portion of the South Sholapur taluka. They were near the eastern boundary of Akkalkot taluka. All of them are Kannada-speaking villages. Before reorganisation they were 'islands' or 'pockets'. The fate of these villages has got to be linked up with the adjoining areas of Kurundwad State and of Akkalkot State. There is no question of any special consideration about them.

2.60. The whole taluka of Akkalkot could have been considered as a unit since the two main component parts of that taluka were Akkalkot State which was an independent and autonomous princely State and a portion of Kurundwad State, which was equally a part of an independent and autonomous princely State. Both these components joined together could also have been equally considered as a unit and they could well have been considered as having the status of a district for the purpose of allocation between linguistic States. Considered from this point of view it may be seen that 55.5 per cent of the population of the whole taluka speak Kannada and only 23.3 per cent speak Marathi. Hence the whole taluka deserves to be included in Mysore State. Unfortunately this aspect of the case that these units formed an independent unit was not brought to the notice of the States Reorganisation Commission. That question deserves to be reviewed and reconsidered and the

mistake of placing it in Maharashtra forming it a part of Sholapur deserves to be remedied. Akkalkot which is the headquarters of the taluka is a town with a population of 18,112. It is claimed by Maharashtra on the ground that this town together with a few villages is a Marathi area and the same should be detached from the Akkalkot taluka and retained in Maharashtra. Despite the fact that it was ruled by a Marathi chief, the population of the town is not even one half Marathi-speaking—it is 44 per cent. The position of this town needs special consideration. The linguistic complexion of the town will have to be determined not merely by the percentage of the people speaking one language or the other in that town but also by the language spoken in the villages in the neighbourhood of the town as also the trade and economic relations of the town with the neighbouring villages. Adjoining the limits of Akkalkot town on three sides there are 11 villages. All these are Kannada villages. Out of these 3 or 4 villages are claimed by the Maharashtra Government merely on the technical ground that the percentage of Marathi-speaking people though less than 50 per cent is slightly more than that of Kannada-speaking people. In the considered opinion of the Committee the whole taluka of Akkalkot deserves to be kept in tact and allocated to Mysore.

2.61. Eight villages of Aland taluka are claimed as Marathi-speaking. The total population of these villages is 4,978. Out of them 3,356 are Marathi-speaking. The whole of Gulbarga district and the whole of Aland taluka are Kannada-speaking. This taluka has 129 villages with a population of 1,34,524 of whom the percentage of Kannada-speaking is 48 and of Marathi-speaking is 17. The only point regarding these 8 villages is that Marathi-speaking is 67.5 per cent and the adjoining Omerga taluka is Marathi. These villages are quite close to Aland, the headquarters of the taluka. There is no special reason to detach these 8 villages merely on the ground that the Marathi-speaking population has a majority.

2.62. About Bidar district the Committee expressed the opinion that there was such an agreement and that the agreement so arrived at should not be so lightly interfered with.

2.63. The claim of the Government of Maharashtra for 28 villages with an area of 115.1 sq. miles in Humnabad taluka is not permissible. The population that would be affected by such a claim would be 22,303. The percentage of Kannada-speaking is 48 and the Marathi-speaking is 17, Telugu 11 and others 24. In fact many villages roundabout, including those claimed as Marathi villages in this taluka and also those in Bhalki, have all trade connections with Kalyan where they market their produce. The opinion expressed by the Mysore members on the Committee was that the contentions of the Government of Maharashtra that more people speak Marathi in those villages and that they are contiguous to Maharashtra, are not sufficient grounds for disturbing them from their present position in this taluka.

2.64. As regards the Bhalki taluka, it was said in the report of the Mysore representatives that to the east of this taluka lies the taluka of Bidar, which is a Kannada area. The Government of

Maharashtra has claimed 49 villages in Bhalki taluka. Bhalki is connected with Bidar by road as well as by rail. The distance is only 32 miles. Apart from its being the taluka headquarter, it is a good trading centre in the taluka. The only other place commanding some trade in this taluka is Hulsoor. Hulsoor is a town with Kannada majority of 52 per cent. Most of the villages claimed by Maharashtra have trade relations with Bhalki, if not with Kalyan. Bhalki is linked with Bidar, the district place, both in regard to trade as well as in administrative matters. From what little we gathered from the people who supported the contention that the Marathi villages in the taluka should be transferred to Maharashtra, they were of the opinion that the villages should be transferred along with the town of Bhalki and not if the town is not transferred.

2.65. Sixty-nine villages in Santpur taluka with an area of 218.4 sq. miles are claimed by Maharashtra. The population involved in the transfer will be 46,669.

2.66. Both Aurad as well as Santpur are connected by road to Bidar. The distance between Bidar and Santpur is about 45 miles. Three linguistic groups prior to reorganisation agreed that these villages should go to Karnatak. Communication facilities of these villages are with the taluka headquarters and with Bidar, the district headquarters. No similar facilities of communication are with the talukas of Nilanga or Udgir or with the district place, Osmanabad.

2.67. The Four-Man Committee having failed to resolve the boundary dispute between Maharashtra and Mysore, the agitation continued unabatedly for about four years. The Working Committee of the Congress then asked the two Chief Ministers to sit together and find an amicable solution to the problem. They held meetings together on two or three occasions and in a very cordial atmosphere, but without reaching any conclusion. The boundary talks took place in Delhi, but led to no solution. In October, 1966, the Prime Minister and the Congress President met leaders of both sides in a bid to evolve a compromise formula, but both sides adhered firmly to their stands. A high-power delegation of Congressmen from Maharashtra and Bombay led by the President of Maharashtra Pradesh Congress Committee met the Prime Minister and the Congress President and the Home Minister, and urged upon them that a Commission should be appointed without delay and its terms of reference should be settled by the Working Committee. Otherwise the Opposition parties in Maharashtra would exploit the situation to dislodge the Congress. It was made clear that it would be difficult for the Maharashtra Cabinet to function if there was any further delay in the setting up of this Commission. The matter reached a high pitch when Shri Naik was reported to have been authorised by his Cabinet colleagues to take a tough line in the Working Committee meeting and offer the resignation of the Cabinet, if necessary. The Mysore Finance Minister explained to the Union Cabinet the Mysore stand. A delegation from Kasaragod arrived with a mass petition demanding that the Working Committee should decide in favour of Kasaragod's merger in Mysore.

2.68. It was in these circumstances that the Government of India after all this prolonged tension, which had been aggravated by the Opposition parties and groups, decided with the concurrence of the States concerned to appoint the One-Man Commission as mentioned above.