

# Beginning of the Formation of Linguistic States

**Dharmendra Kumar Neeraj<sup>1</sup>, Sukalyan Moitra<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Assistant Professor, Atma Ram Sanatan Dharma College

<sup>2</sup>Associate Professor, Vinoba Bhave University Hazaribag

## Abstract

Reorganisation of states in an important provision provided under the Constitution of India. For understanding the concepts and factors working behind the reorganisation of states this article helps a lot. The aim of this article is to show how the states got formed on the linguistics states. This paper is not limited to the philosophical aspect but also discuss a present case.

The content provided in this article is written after analysing various other scholars writings, due to this it gets its authenticity. This paper provides the analysis of the beginning of the formation of linguistic states.

It is hoped that the analysis under this study will help the readers, researchers, and practitioners in understanding the concept of reorganisation of the states in India so that they can become more efficient in their work.

**Keywords:** Reorganisation, States, Constitution, Committees, Cases.

## Introduction

The Princely States' merger and integration process was complete, and it was now possible to create new states from geographically small and linguistically homogeneous regions.

## First linguistic state born

In 1953, a state's border was altered for the first time since the constitution's inception. As a result, an area that had previously been a part of the Madras State was divided into the new state of Andhra. Congress proposed that the rearrangement of states would depend on the preferences of the relevant populace in its election programme from 1951. While linguistic considerations were crucial, other considerations including economic, administrative, and financial ones also needed to be made.

The Telegu-speaking Andhra was approved to be separated from the state of Madras and was constituted as a new state after the aforementioned adjustment had been incorporated into the Congress strategy.

## Separate andhra demand is very old

There has long been a demand for an independent Andhra state. As previously mentioned, the Indian National Congress decided to create a separate Congress unit for Andhra in 1917 after consulting the Telegu representatives of the Madras Provincial Congress Committee to meet the requirement for the establishment of a Telegu-speaking province in due course. Andhra and Karnataka provinces were also wanted when the provinces of Sind and Orissa were established in 1936. Thirteen to fourteen Telegu-speaking districts in the Madras presidency concurred to exert all of their influence in favour of establishing their province, which the Congress Constitution recognised as "Andhra Pradesh."

The J.V.P. Committee advocated giving the issue of the construction of a distinct Andhra State top priority and only taking into account redistribution "after careful consideration of each separate case."

Andhra's situation can be distinguished from others in that there seems to be widespread support for it and the biggest compact area likely to be a part of this linguistic province is contained within a single province. Therefore, if a start must be made, we would advise that the issue emerging from the split of the Andhra Province be studied and examined to determine whether or not this province may be divided. If the required requirements are met, we advise that action be taken to put it into effect.

The Raja of Babboli and Shri V.V. Giri made a compelling argument for the creation of a distinct province for the Andhras during the IInd Round Table Conference. Mr. Giri proclaimed, "Andhra belong to a very ancient race and have as brilliant a past as many other nations in the world," remembering how they formerly held sway over a sizeable kingdom. However, Mr. Giri was the one who made the connection between the success of an Indian federal democracy and the issue of linguistic regions. He asserted that the formation of a distinct Andhra Province was consistent with the principle of provincial autonomy.

The conditions set forth by the congress as necessary for the formation of a separate Andhra State were to play an important role in the controversy which was to develop later. These conditions were:

1. The state was to consist of well-defined areas mutually agreed upon and be confined to the province of Madras.
2. It was to be formed with the willingness and consent of the other parts of Madras Province. Andhra were to abandon their claim to the city of Madras.

### **Hindrances in the creation of the state:**

Speaking in Parliament in July 1952, Shri Jawahar Lal Nehru recalled the work of the year 1949, when it was agreed to divide the Madras state with the mutual consent of Tamil and Telegu-speaking people. But at the last moment, a conflict appeared with regard to the city of Madras and the partition of state could not take place.

The delay in partition was not merely a linguistic question that was involved for the problem had a close connection with the mutual interest of the people residing in Rayalaseema areas and the coastal districts. The first difficulty was felt about the city of Madras. Its population was mainly comprised of Tamil and Telegu-speaking people. The choosing of the capital for the forthcoming new state became a difficult task and it developed into a regional conflict among the people. Upon the request of the Central Government, Madras set up a partition committee which made recommendations to the government of India. The Union Government on January 24th, 1950 issued a communique announcing that lack of agreement on essential issues such as the status of Madras city, the apportionment of assets and liabilities, the boundaries of the province (particularly concerning Bellary district), the position of Rayalseems and finances of the new province made the formation of Andhra impracticable. Another aspect of the problem was that the reorganisation scheme for one state was also to affect the neighbouring areas, as one linguistic region touched the other. It was an intermingling of languages in many places, particularly in big cities. For example, Hyderabad was such a city and held a key position in the South from the political, economic and linguistic points of view. Many people came there and settled; it represented a mixture of many religious and linguistic communities. The envisaged changes in the state boundaries in this region had many effects. The political importance of the disintegration of

Hyderabad lay in putting an end to the elements of the old regime of the Nizam and in remoulding it to serve the purpose of modern administration.

Dr. Lenka Sundaram, a member of Parliament supported the disintegration of Hyderabad and pleaded that the disintegration of Hyderabad supplied the key to the formation of linguistic states in India. He stated that there were three smell and residual points relating to Andhra Desh –

1. "MADRAS CITY: No Andhra would surrender his claim. I am sure every Andhra would accept it as a centrally administered area.
2. Disintegration of Hyderabad: It must be there and we Andhres, have come to this conclusion. The Hyderabad State Congress has been committed to dis- integration and Maharashtrians, Kannadigas and Andhras.
3. RAYAL ASEEMA: There have been statements and counter statements during the past few weeks to the effect that Rayal Aseema, would not like to come into Andhra Pradesh.

### **Royal Aseema people went to cooperate.**

It is sure that there will be more and more goodwill and understanding will be coming- forth. But if they went to get attached to Tamilnadu, I am sure that will not be objected to".

### **Agitation for separate Andhra :**

During the summer of 1951, the agitation for a separate Andhra state became acute. In July 1952 Prime Minister spoke against a communist revolution in the lower house of Parliament for the immediate creation of linguistic states but declared his support for a separate Andhra provided there was agreement on Madras City and Rayal Aseema. By the autumn of 1952 differences among Andhra leaders had developed over how Andhra should be separated from Madras and over the details of the constitution of the new state. The controversy had become especially bitter over the disposition of Madras city. Spokesmen from the Rayalaseema areas declared that they would never agree to the formation of an Andhra state which did not include the city of Medres. The communists maintained a firm position which sought to award Madres city to the residual Madras state. Andhra communists by urging a plebiscite to decide the city's future were in effect re-affirming the party's position that 'Madras belongs to Tamiliens" Prime Minister Nehru, addressing the upper house of Parliament early in December made it clear that the city of Madras, in no case, be included in an Andhra state. Towards the end of 1952, the agitation for a separate Andhra Pradesh drew to dramatic climax. A respected Andhra patriot and a veteran of the independence movement Potti Sriramulu entered a fast unto death for the formation of a separate Telegu-speaking state. After the death of Potti Sriramulu violent agitation was started. The horrible situation of the agitation was described by the Deputy Speaker on 17th December 1952 in the house, "destruction of Railway property, stoppage of trains and telephonic communications, widespread disturbance of peace and loss of life due to police firing in Nellore which is fraught with dangerous consequences to the peace, tranquillity and stability of India, the state of emergency created in Andhra Desh, arising out of the passing away of Sri Sriramulu, the situation resulting in police firing, killing three persons and wounding a large number of citizens in Nellore, the huge loss of public property amounting to two crores of rupees at Vijayawada railway station and the inability of the authorities to prevent the same ". Soon it was discovered that it would be wiser to bisect the state than attempt to hold it together and the Government of India announced to do so. On December 19th Prime Minister Nehru announced that his government had decided to establish an Andhra State consisting of the Telegu-

speaking areas of the present Madras state, but not including the city of Madras and Justice Wanchoo was appointed to give his report on the decision.

### **Report of Justice Mishra :**

Following this decision, Justice Misra was asked to examine and report on the future of the Bellary taluq. Justice Misra reached the decision "Bellary taluq should go as a whole to the state of Mysore subject to the transitional arrangements are designed to provide facilities to the Andhra State." Based on the recommendations made in Justice Misra's Report the Government of India decided to transfer the whole of Bellary taluq to the state of Mysore. On 10th August 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 linguistic province, came into existence on 1st October, 1953.

### **Time for re-organisation:**

As soon as Prime Minister Nehru's announcement on the formation of Andhra had been made to the lower house of Parliament, a communist member rose to voice the demand for a Kerala State, while in the Upper House, another communist made a similar move on behalf of Karnataka. A communist editorial held that the formation of Andhra would "inspire Malayalee, Kannadige, Tamil, Gujarati and Maharashtrian people to give added strength to their struggle for Aikya Kerala, Mehe Gujarat and Senyukts Maharashtra." J.V.P. Committee had rightly observed "The concession of one will stimulate the demand for the resultant controversies, it will seriously divert our attention and energies from more urgent and pressing problems affecting the very life and existence of the community". 1. Prime Minister Nehru and his government still felt that an appropriate occasion had not come to plan the change in state territories on a large scale. It would not be wrong to say that the government was reluctant to meet the wide change in state boundaries.

The desirability of the redistribution of provincial territories was recognised from time to time even by British Statesmen. In the year 1903 Lord Curzon considered the time to be appropriate for such undertaking and the result was the first partition of Bengal. The Montague Chelmsford Report 1918 recognised the need for a general redistribution but did not consider the time opportune for such changes. It expressed the view that "redistribution" ought in any case to follow and neither to precede nor accompany constitutional reform". Indian statutory commission also recommended a Re-distribution of provincial boundaries, particularly because of the change in the status of provinces consequent on a substantial decentralisation of powers ending the ultimate 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 boundary commission to be set up by the Government of India.

After the transfer of power in the India Linguistic Provinces Commission and J.V.P. Committee reported in April 1949. Both these bodies were concerned with the limited question of the formation of linguistic provinces. However, they suggested the postponement of the formation of provinces.

Dhar 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 on the ground that -

1. India was burdened with problems more urgent than the problem of the redistribution of provinces, such as those of defence, food and production.
2. It could not afford to add to its anxieties the heat, controversy and bitterness that the demarcation of boundaries and the allotment of capital cities of Bombay and Madras would involve.
3. The economic consequences of splitting up existing provinces into several new provinces required a great deal of study, preparation and planning and; (4) the administrative personnel available at the time was inadequate to bear the additional burden of running new governments. 1. The J.V.P. committee did not consider the time opportune for reorganisation because it was likely to –
4. divert attention from vital matters;
5. retard the process of consolidation of the nation's gains;
6. dislocate the administrative, economic and financial structure of the country and seriously interfere with the progressive solution to our economic and political difficulties;
7. set loose while we were still in the formative stage, forces of disruption and disintegration.

The problem of reorganisation became emergent because India with her programme of large-scale planning had to think in terms of enduring political units.

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

Those opposed to Reorganisation argued:

1. 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 have now disappeared in 1952.
2. Problems created by the partition, including the complicated problem of Kashmir have to be settled.
3. The international situation and developments across borders do not admit any dissipation of national energies and resources.
4. The economic development of the country continues to demand the highest priority and;
5. any large-scale changes in the existing set-up are bound to generate provincial feelings and impair national solidarity.

J.V.P. Committee also suggested that reorganisation should be done when the conditions were more static and the state of people's minds calmer, the adjustment of these boundaries or the creation of new provinces could be undertaken with relative ease and with advantage to all concerned. While language is a binding force, it is also a separating one. India needed the balance of all considerations. It stated, "We would prefer to postpone the formation of new provinces for a few years so that we might concentrate during this period on other matters of vital importance and not allow ourselves to be distracted by this question".

Some people felt that Congress had to deal with reorganisation as soon as possible. They have taken the people so far and now it was not possible to put them out on the reverse gear. Sardar Hukum Singh stated in the Parliament "It may be the whole thing and may turn turtle, if at this stage it were to be said that because there are difficulties, we are not going further and that we should go back. If now they feel that there are difficulties, certainly there are, I do admit they are to be solved. It is not a nationalistic

approach, but rather a bureaucratic one to say now that unless the people agree on themselves, we are not prepared to take up that question. The national government has to take up that responsibility and proceed further to solve the problem that it has created for itself. There is no question of going back so far as I can see". Dr Ambedker in his book "Maharashtra As A Linguistic Province" discusses the topic under the heading "Can the creation of Linguistic Provinces be postponed". In this connection he has placed the following considerations-

1. There is nothing new in the demand for linguistic provinces. Six provinces East Punjab, United Provinces, Bihar, West Bengal, Assam, and Orissa, already exist as linguistic provinces. The provinces which are clamouring for being reconstituted on a linguistic basis are (1) Bombay (ii) Madras (iii) Central Provinces. When the principle of linguistic provinces is accepted in the case of six provinces, the other provinces which are asking the same principle to be applied to them, cannot be asked to wait indefinitely.
2. The situation in the non-linguistic provinces has become exasperating if not dangerous and is in no way different from the situation as it existed in the Old Turkish Empire or the old Austro-Hungarian Empire.
3. The demand for Linguistic provinces is an explosive force of the same character which was responsible for blowing up the Old Turkish Empire or Austro-Hungarian Empire. It is better not to allow it to get too hot when it may become difficult to prevent an explosion.
4. So long as the provinces were not democratic in their constitutions and so long as they did not possess the widest sovereign powers that the new constitution gave them, the urgency of linguistic provinces was not very great but with the new constitution, the problem has become very urgent".

In 1955, on 27th December, Dr. K.K. Panniker said that the present was the right time for reorganisation. He warned that any postponement of the Reorganisation plan would "Cut further the roots of national unity." N.V. Gadgil compared the reorganisation of states with the achievement of freedom and said "The problem of Reorganisation of states is as important as the problem of achieving freedom. After all reorganisation of states is an organisation of freedom."

Seth Govind Das said in Lok Sabha that Present states are shaped by the British Government. Just as it has become difficult for us to get rid of the English language in the same manner it has become difficult for us to get rid of this distribution of states. From every point of view, the division of states is faulty. On one side there is a giant state of U.P. and on the other hand, there are Kurg, Ajmer and Delhi of minisize districts. From an economic, cultural and historical point of view, the present state structure is not proper. We have to omit it and should have a new reorganisation as soon as possible."

## Conclusion

Demand for a boundary commission was well favoured. It was stated by protagonists that as long as the Government of India was centralised, both administration and finance of every area were provided and directed from the centre, and the line taken by provincial boundary was less important. But now provinces have achieved a real political existence of their own, the situation has changed and provinces have formed a unit in a federated whole. It has become extremely important that the adjustment of the provincial boundaries and the creation of a proper provincial series should take place before the new process goes too far. Once the mould has been set, any distribution would be still more difficult to correct. Hence it has become urgent that the Government of India should urgently set up a boundary

commission with a neutral Cheirmen which would investigate the main cases in which provincial readjustment has become necessary and should endeavour to work out a scheme for reorganisation. N.C. Chatterji in Lok Sabha said in 1952 that a boundary commission should be appointed to report to Parliament as to how the boundaries of the states should be readjusted keeping in view the consideration of economy, defence and cultural affinity. The Congress Working Committee adopted a resolution in New Delhi on the 20th of September in which it expressed its readiness to reorganise the states and it appealed:-

"In view of the decision of the Government of India to appoint a Commission at an early date to consider the problem of reorganisation of states, the working committee thinks that to ensure a calm atmosphere for the fullest consideration of this vital problem, public agitation for the formation of new states or any changes in the boundaries of states is undesirable and uncalled. "

Hence S.R. Commissi on became a need of the day and received urgent attention. Prime Minister Nehru in his speech at Medres said The process has begun and let us do it well." He further added "Let us not be afraid of it or be sorry about it. It is a historical development which is taking place or is going to take place all over India in various shapes."

### Bibliography

1. Report of The States Reorganisation Commission, 1955 (Manager of Publication, New Delhi) para 264.
2. The Time of India (Bombay) 23<sup>rd</sup> December 1953.
3. Dr. Mukerji & Mrs. Rameswamy, Reorganisation of Indian States, P. 17 (The Popular Book Depot, Lamington Road, Bombay-7.1955).
4. Report of The States Reorganisation Commission 1955. Para 25.
5. Report of The Official Language Commission, 1956 P. 29 (New Delhi, Government of India Press).
6. Indian and Foreign Review, June 15, 1970 Vol. 7 No. 17 PP-16-17 (Business Manager, Indian Foreign Review. P.B. No. 2011, Delhi)
7. Linguistic Provinces and The Karnataka Problem, (Statement by the Karnatak Provincial Congress, Committee, Hubli 1948) P.68
8. Report of The States Reorganisation Commission 1955. Para 119.
9. Report of The Linguistic Provinces Commission, 1948, Para 181 (Government of India Press).
10. Report of The States Reorganisation Commission 1955. Para 163.
11. Replies and Memorandae To The Linguistic Provinces Commission (1948) – By The Representatives and Associations of Madras and Karnataka. (All Karnatak Unification Sangh. H.O. Manglore, 1948) P.112.
12. A case for the Formation of a New Province United Maharashtra (Poona, Samyukta Maharashtra Publication, 1954) PP 14-25.
13. S.C. Shah, “States Reorganisation Commission & Orissa!” Indian Journal of Political Science, Vol. 16 P. 344.
14. Lok Sabha Debates On the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission 14<sup>th</sup> December to 23<sup>rd</sup> December, 1955 Vol. I.
15. Report of The States Reorganisation Commission 1955. Para 177.
16. Report of The States Reorganisation Commission 1955. Para 174.