

## Note on Uttar Pradesh

The position of Uttar Pradesh in the Union of India is something which no one interested in the reorganisation of the States of India can legitimately overlook. It contains over 63 million people or over one-sixth of the population of India. It is divided into 51 districts, and the average population in each district is over 1.2 millions. An army of officials (nearly 260,000) is required to administer it. The uniqueness of this position will become apparent when it is remembered that the next largest State in India, Bihar, has only a population of 40 millions (or less than two-thirds of Uttar Pradesh), while most of the other States have less than 30 millions. In population *the Uttar Pradesh is nearly equal to Andhra, Telangana, Karnataka and Kerala* put together, larger than the combined population of the Punjab, Rajasthan and the new Madhya Pradesh (including Mahakosal, Vindhya Pradesh, Madhya Bharat and Bhopal). The imbalance created by the existence of a State of this size in a federation seems to me to be fairly obvious.

2. I consider it essential for the successful working of a federation that the units should be fairly evenly balanced. Too great a disparity is likely to create not only suspicion and resentment but generate forces likely to undermine the federal structure itself and thereby be a danger to the unity of the country. This is clearly recognised everywhere. In most federal constitutions, though wide variations exist in respect of the population and resources of the unit, care is taken to limit the influence and authority of the larger States. Thus in the United States of America, for example, though the States are of varying population and resources and the State of New York has many times the population, say of Nevada, the constitution provides for equal representation of every state in the Senate. In the Soviet Union also, in which Great Russia has a larger population than most other units of the Federation taken together, representation in the House of Nationalities is weighted against her so that the other units of the Federation may not be dominated by the larger unit. In the Bismarckian Reich again, though Prussia had a dominant position from the point of view of population, she was given less representation in the *Reichsrat* or the house representing the states than she was entitled to (less than one-third) and the permanent presidency of that body was vested in Bavaria, clearly demonstrating that even here—where there was a concentration of

political, military and economic power in one state—it was considered necessary, in the interests of the union, to give weightage to the smaller units and also to reduce Prussia to the position of a minority in the *Reichsrat*, States Council, which enjoyed greater powers than the *Reichstag* or the House of the People.

3. Unfortunately, the Indian Constitution contains no such provision to diminish the disparity or to counteract the dominant influence of one unit, let alone to secure the equality of the States. In both Houses of Parliament representation is, broadly speaking, on the basis of population. Thus in the Lok Sabha, Uttar Pradesh has 86 members (out of 499) and in the Rajya Sabha it has 31 (out of 216).

4. If one were realistic and took into consideration the manner in which governments functioned all over the world, it would be easy to see that this preponderant influence which would accrue to a very large unit could be abused, and would in any case be resented by all the other constituent units. Modern governments are controlled, to a greater or lesser extent, by party machines, within which the voting power of a numerically strong group goes a very long way. It is also undeniable that there is a natural tendency for the representatives of a state to form or to be brought together into such a powerful political bloc. The real issue, therefore, is whether it is desirable to place any unit in a position to exercise an unduly large measure of political influence.

5. The consequence of the present imbalance, caused by the denial of the federal principle of equality of units, has been to create feelings of distrust and resentment in all the States outside Uttar Pradesh. Not only in the southern States but also in the Punjab, Bengal and elsewhere the view was generally expressed before the Commission that the present structure of government led to the dominance of Uttar Pradesh in all-India matters. The existence of this feeling will hardly be denied by anyone. That it will be a danger to our unity, if such feelings are allowed to exist and remedies are not sought and found now, will also not be denied. Since the normal constitutional device for equalising grave disparities between the units in a federation, that is the provision of equal or at least heavily weighted representation in the house representing the federal principle, is not now possible in our case, and even if it were possible, would not now be a satisfactory solution, in view of the dominant position of the House of the People, the only remedy open to us is to reconstitute the overgrown state in such a manner as to lessen the differences—in short to partition the state. This seems to me an obvious proposition.

6. The objections which have been advanced against this proposal may now be considered.

7. One of the commonest arguments advanced before us by leaders in Uttar Pradesh was that the existence of a large, powerful and well-organised state in the Gangetic Valley was a guarantee for India's unity; that such a state would be able to correct the disruptive tendencies of other states, and to ensure the ordered progress of India. The same idea has been put to us in many other forms such as that Uttar Pradesh is the "back bone of India", the centre from which all other states derive their ideas and their culture, etc. It is not necessary to examine these claims seriously for nothing is more certain to undermine our growing sense of unity than this claim of suzerainty or paramountcy by one state over others.

8. A second argument which has been advanced is that the Uttar Pradesh is a homogeneous and integrated state and that to partition it would be to ruin its economy and to create discontent. In this connection the agitation that followed the partition of Bengal has been pointed out to us as a warning. The process of administrative unification of this area started only in 1775 when Asaf-ud-daula made over to the English East India Company some territory in the south-eastern portion of the State as it is constituted today. The doab between the Ganga and the Yamuna was acquired by the British from Sadat Ali, Nawab of Oudh, only in 1801, and Kumaon and Garhwal were annexed in 1816 after the Anglo-Gurkha war. The territory north of the Yamuna was ceded by the Mahrattas between 1803 and 1805, after the Second Mahratta War. Oudh, of course, was annexed very late (by Lord Dalhousie in 1856). For all practical purposes, therefore, the existing State of Uttar Pradesh has had a continuous history of less than a hundred years. The argument that it is a well-knit area which cannot be broken up without undesirable consequences is not, in these circumstances, impressive.

9. On the other hand, there is plenty of evidence that nothing has happened during these hundred years to alter the basic fact that this area has but little unity. There is or can be very little in common between the still nomadic inhabitants of the Garhwal and Kumaon Himalayas or of the hilly area of Bundelkhand on the one hand and the inhabitants of the fertile Gangetic Valley on the other. Even within the plains, the Khadar and Bungar (dry) areas in the Meerut division are quite different from the fertile valley of the Ganga which has been further enriched by the Ganga Canal. Not unnaturally, the problems of these areas also differ; and

an administration which has so large a population to look after is not necessarily in the best position to attend to the particular regional problems of these areas.

10. The example of Bengal quoted as a warning does not bear examination. Bengal was a historic unity, and besides, its partition was frankly for the purpose of creating a Muslim majority unit in East Bengal. The partition of Bengal was thus not merely an injustice to the Bengali people but an attempt to favour one community at the expense of another. The present proposal is based on purely political and administrative grounds and does not cause injustice to any one.

11. Thirdly, it has been contended that the size of the Uttar Pradesh contributes to economy in administration. In its memorandum submitted to this Commission, the Uttar Pradesh Government has stated that the percentage of expenditure on civil administration in Uttar Pradesh is lower than in many other Part A States; and from this, the conclusion has been drawn that the existing State of Uttar Pradesh is in a position to save considerably on overheads. I find it somewhat difficult to accept this argument. There are several States in India where the percentage of expenditure on administrative services is less than in the Uttar Pradesh, as the following figures from Appendix IX of the Report of the Finance Commission, 1952, will indicate:

STATES	1950-51	1951-52	1952-53
Assam	19.6	20.4	16.7
Bihar	30.0	26.4	25.4
Bombay	25.7	26.6	24.2
Madhya Pradesh	28.9	27.7	23.1
Madras	27.6	27.9	25.6
Orissa	24.6	27.9	26.3
Punjab	31.2	30.6	29.9
<i>Uttar Pradesh</i>	28.4	27.0	24.6
West Bengal	25.3	27.7	25.5
Hyderabad	26.1	26.0	20.0
Madhya Bharat	24.1	26.6	23.1
Mysore	12.9	15.0	13.1
Pepsu	28.6	32.3	28.0
Rajasthan	29.6	29.8	28.5
Saurashtra	34.6	31.4	31.0
Travancore-Cochin	12.0	12.3	11.4

(Percentage figures which are lower than that of the Uttar Pradesh have been italicised). Even more revealing is the *per capita*

expenditure on general administration. In 1950-51, this was 0.8 for Uttar Pradesh. For Assam, Bihar, Mysore and Travancore-Cochin, the figure was less, while it was the same for Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, West Bengal and Hyderabad. In 1951-52, again, the *per capita* expenditure on general administration was less in Bihar, Hyderabad and Travancore-Cochin. In 1952-53, it was less in Assam, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Hyderabad, Mysore and Travancore-Cochin.

12. Moreover, the test of economical and efficient administration is obviously whether a State is or has been in a position to increase the expenditure on nation-building services. It does not appear that the Uttar Pradesh can claim any particular advantage or achievements in this matter. Again I give certain figures from Appendix IX of the Finance Commission's Report. The *per capita* expenditure on social services in Uttar Pradesh in 1950-51 was Rs. 2.4, against Rs. 3.1 for Assam, Rs. 6.0 for Bombay, Rs. 3.3 for Madras, Rs. 3.1 for Punjab, Rs. 3.6 for West Bengal, Rs. 3.2 for Hyderabad, Rs. 3.9 for Madhya Bharat, Rs. 6.9 for Mysore, Rs. 3.4 for Pepsu, Rs. 5.2 for Saurashtra and Rs. 4.2 for Travancore-Cochin. The *per capita* expenditure on social services in Uttar Pradesh for 1950-51 was the same as for the undeveloped State of Rajasthan, *viz.*, Rs. 2.4. In 1951-52, only in Bihar and Orissa was the *per capita* expenditure on social services less than in Uttar Pradesh. As against Rs. 2.4 for Uttar Pradesh, the figure was as high as Rs. 5.7 in both Bombay and Mysore. Even in Rajasthan the figure was Rs. 2.8. In 1952-53, the tale was repeated and only in Bihar and Orissa was *per capita* expenditure on social service less than in Uttar Pradesh. As against Rs. 2.7 for Uttar Pradesh, Mysore had a figure of Rs. 6.8 and Bombay Rs. 6.0. The same story is revealed in the matter of education. In all the years from 1950-51 to 1952-53, only Bihar and Orissa have spent less per head on education than Uttar Pradesh; all other States have spent more. As against Rs. 1.1 in 1950-51 for Uttar Pradesh, Bombay spent Rs. 3.5; in 1951-52, Bombay spent Rs. 3.4, as against Rs. 1.2 for Uttar Pradesh; in 1952-53, Bombay spent Rs. 3.6, Mysore Rs. 3.7, Travancore-Cochin Rs. 3.6 and Saurashtra Rs. 3.0, as against Rs. 1.3 for Uttar Pradesh. These figures are revealing enough.

13. Further, I find no evidence to justify the claim that the Uttar Pradesh Government because of the size of the State has been a particularly efficient one. Uttar Pradesh has the lowest literacy of all the Part A States in India including Orissa and even some of the Part B and C States. The following figures from the Census Report of 1951 show how bad the position is:

STATE	PERCENTAGE
Andhra . . . . .	15·0
Assam . . . . .	18·1
Bihar . . . . .	12·2
Bombay . . . . .	24·6
Madras . . . . .	21·8
Madhya Pradesh . . . . .	13·5
Orissa . . . . .	15·8
Punjab . . . . .	16·1
Uttar Pradesh . . . . .	10·8
West Bengal . . . . .	24·5
Mysore . . . . .	20·3
Saurashtra . . . . .	18·5
Travancore-Cochin . . . . .	46·4
Ajmer . . . . .	20·1
Coorg . . . . .	27·2
Delhi . . . . .	38·4
Kutch . . . . .	17·1
Manipur . . . . .	11·4
Tripura . . . . .	15·5

(vide Census Paper No. 5, 1954)

14. Even the report on education in the States of the Indian Union which gives slightly different figures does not alter the fact that Uttar Pradesh is now probably the most backward Part A State in the matter of education. Nor could the State claim that in the matter of medical services, road transportation and maintenance of law and order it is in a better position than Bombay or the Southern Indian States.

15. The argument put forward by some of the M.L.As. from the western districts in their memorandum submitted to us clearly show that the claim of homogeneity and the desire of the different areas of the Uttar Pradesh to remain together have, to say the least, been over-stated. The points they have raised deserve consideration and indicate that in some parts of the State at least there is a feeling of serious dissatisfaction. I have no desire to go into the merits of the complaints made by them and the arguments they have advanced in favour of the separation of the western districts beyond saying that they provide evidence of the existence of a considerable body of opinion desiring, on administrative and economic grounds, the creation of a separate state in Western Uttar Pradesh. It has been

argued that these demands are of recent origin and therefore do not deserve serious consideration. The agitation for separation may not be of old standing but then it has to be remembered that substantial economic and social development by the State has been taken up only recently and economic rivalries have, therefore, only recently come to the forefront.

16. Lastly, it has been held that even accepting that the present imbalance created by the disproportionate size of Uttar Pradesh is something which requires consideration, there is no case for a partition of the state as the imbalance is not due to anything Uttar Pradesh itself has done, but is the result of other states having been partitioned. It is argued, that when Bengal, Madras and the Punjab existed as unpartitioned states, there was no great disparity between the major units and if as a result of the creation of Pakistan the Punjab and Bengal were partitioned and if further the Andhras and the Tamils could not live together and had therefore to separate, these provide no justification for reducing the size of Uttar Pradesh. Granted that the present predominance of Uttar Pradesh is due to the division of Bengal and the partition of Madras for neither of which Uttar Pradesh is in any way to blame. But the essential point to consider is that a new situation has thereby been created which affects the political structure of India and generates forces likely to affect its unity and stability. In such circumstances, it is in my opinion irrelevant to consider whether Uttar Pradesh had any responsibility in bringing about the present situation. The plain fact is that the present situation has to be faced in the general interests of India, especially from the point of view of eliminating those developments and trends which create suspicion and resentment in other States situated further away from the capital.

17. If a partition of Uttar Pradesh would cause hardship to any considerable section of people of the residual State, or generally create political instability, then the opposition to it could have been understood. No such arguments have been advanced. In fact even after a partition of the kind suggested below, Uttar Pradesh will still have a population of over 40 millions and will continue to be the biggest unit in India. It would have the major industrial area of Kanpur, and would include the cities of Allahabad, Lucknow and Banaras. The State would still have a larger population than Bihar and Bombay (as we have proposed it to be reconstituted), and the present situation would be greatly remedied.

18. From the point of view of the interests of the people of Uttar Pradesh, the partition would involve no hardship. The districts of Dehra Dun, Naini Tal and Pilibhit would be left in residuary Uttar Pradesh, which would thus have control over the headworks of the Sarda Canal system. The river and canal waters would have to be shared between the new State and the residuary Uttar Pradesh. This should not cause any difficulties, as such sharing is the normal feature in India. The various parts of residuary Uttar Pradesh, including Kumaon Division, would also be physically contiguous. Indeed, the partition would be greatly to the advantage of the people of Uttar Pradesh, as the present unmanageable size of this State, as I have pointed out earlier, stands in the way of efficient administration.

19. We are today at a critical stage of our political evolution. The problem of the reorganisation of the States touches the very root of our political structure. We are proposing now a rationalisation of the units which constitute the federation and it is our hope that the states constituted as we have proposed will provide a sound and strong foundation for our unity. If on this occasion when the whole problem of the states' structure in relation to the Centre is being seriously considered, we omit to rectify what I consider to be the major and basic weakness of the Indian Constitution—the extraordinary disparity between one unit and the rest—then in my opinion we will only be strengthening the forces of disunity by making it practically impossible to tackle this problem at any later stage. I am convinced that the decision the Government of India takes about Uttar Pradesh will determine the course of our evolution the sanctity, the strength and the faith of the people in our Constitution, which should be the palladium of our rights and the source of our political unity. It is my deep conviction that if at this time when the whole issue is before the country, this unnatural feature of our Constitution is not set aright, the faith of the people in the Constitution—which consciously or otherwise provides for the predominance of one area—will be weakened. It is solely out of this feeling that I have ventured to place my views on record.

#### **The proposal**

1. My proposal is that a new State should be created consisting of the Meerut, Agra, Rohilkhand and Jhansi Divisions of Uttar Pradesh (*minus* Dehra Dun district of Meerut Division and Pilibhit district of Rohilkhand Division), the district of Datia from Vindhya Pradesh and the four districts of Bhind. Morena, Gird (Gwalior) and Shivpuri from Madhya Bharat.

2. The total area of this State would be 51,346 sq. miles, and the total population, according to the 1951 Census, will be 24,365,931.

3. The area of residuary Uttar Pradesh would be 74,998 sq. miles, and the population 41,182,075, according to the 1951 Census.

4. The new State might have Agra as its capital and might be called the "State of Agra". Agra will be conveniently situated from the point of view of communications. The State thus constituted would be manageable in size and population, and will generally speaking be homogeneous with resources sufficient to carry out its development programmes.

5. The current revenue of the districts included in the proposed Agra State was of the order of Rs. 27-28 crores, with a surplus of Rs. 1 to 1.5 crores, during the period of three years ending March, 1953. The current revenue of residuary Uttar Pradesh was of the order of Rs. 35.5 crores during the same period, with a deficit of Rs. 3.75 to 4 crores. The size of the revenue budget has increased, for various reasons, in the case of both the units since March, 1953. But there is no reason to anticipate that Western Uttar Pradesh will have to face financial embarrassment. Equally, Eastern Uttar Pradesh will be able to make up its initial deficit by reviewing some of its taxation measures. The new Finance Commission will, no doubt, take all factors into account and try to minimise the deficit of residuary Uttar Pradesh.

K. M. PANIKKAR.

NEW DELHI,

*Dated 30th September 1955.*