The Evolution of Indian Provinces During the British Period

When we speak of India as a Union of States, we understand that its Constituent Units are autonomous within their political boundaries and that they are coming together and creating a federal State for certain geographical, cultural, historical and economic considerations by their own free will. The complication is obvious that they are delegating certain powers to the federal State in their own interests. Like the Indian Union, the U.S.A. is also a federal State but the main distinction between the Indian Union and the American Federation is that whereas distinctly separate political States came together and formed a Union in U.S.A. but in India they were merely provinces under the dominance of the British Unitary Power, brought into being for sheer administrative convenience. They were given provincial autonomy and they, in theory, decided to come together as federal Units of the Indian Union. So long as the provinces were not
autonomous and the Central British Power was paramount, there was no particular need for these provinces to be homogeneous units. In any case, that did not come in the way of day to day administration. The Britishers went on subjugating territories after territories in India and the provinces were formed without any plan or design. There was no particular principle involved in the creation of these provinces. Different parts of the country were acquired at different times and hence they could not be organized into well-knit administrative units on a systematic and rational basis. The actual needs, wishes or affinities of the people were ignored.

Mr. N.C. Roy, in his illuminating article on "The Growth of Linguistic States in the Indian Federation," speaking of the above policy of the Britishers expresses the view: "In any event, when we come to British times, we find no recognition of the linguistic principle in the chalking out of administrative provinces. In 1765, the East India Company received the Diwani from the Emperor of Delhi for the provinces of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa. When the Company actually 'stood forth' as Diwan, the three provinces constituted one Unit and it was on this basis that they continued to be governed.... The
Britishers found it convenient to rule Bengal, Bihar and Orissa as one provincial Unit for nearly one hundred and forty years. The other territories were conquered piece-meal and their provincial affiliation was dictated by administrative convenience and necessity of the time concerned. Sometimes, the people forming a province might speak one language (e.g. North-Western Provinces which later became United Provinces of Agra and Oudh). Sometimes, however, the provinces might be polyglot e.g. Madras Presidency or Bombay Presidency or Central Provinces.

The only matter which engrossed the mind of the people during the eighteenth and a considerable part of 19th century was security. The Great Anarchy of the 18th century had made them only security conscious. Any Government which brought them this security was acceptable. They had no other consciousness. So the people had not only no say in the distribution of territories among provinces, but also had no consciousness in this regard. Nor could it be said that the British Government during the greater part of their rule had any fixed principles in the matter of chalking out provincial boundaries."(1)
Partition of Karnataka

The modern period of Karnataka History is said to begin from the conquest of Mysore by the British and the death of Tippu in 1799. When the modern period of Karnataka History commenced, there was Maratha rule in Northern Karnataka, that of the Nizam in the north-east of Karnataka and British domination in South Karnataka (Old Mysore area). Haider's son Tippu Sultan ruled over Southern Karnataka from 1782 to 1799. He fought several wars with the Britishers. The Nizam and the Marathas were in alliance with the Britishers. In his last war with the Britishers on 4th May 1799 A.D., he gallantly succumbed to the Britishers unto the last breath. After the fall of Tippu Sultan in 1799, the British rule was ultimately established on the soil of present Karnataka. At the fall of Srirangapatana, practically the entire sovereignty of Karnataka fell into the British hands. Mr. H.H. Dodwell, an eminent historian expressed the view: "Thus Tippu's territory was divided, leaving only a small and compact possession for the descendants of the ancient Hindu Rajas, of which the company was to undertake defence, occupying any forte it might choose. Beyond that, the division of
territory had results of considerable political as well as geographical importance. To the English dominions were added the province of Kanara, the district of Coimbatore, Wynad and Dharmapuram and all the land below the Ghats between the coast of Malabar and Carnatic, security, said Wellesley, an uninterrupted tract of territory from the coast of Coromandel to that of Malabar, together with the entire sea-coast of the Kingdom of Mysore. The fortress commanding all the heads of the passes above the Ghats were also secured, and, in addition, the fortresses of Srirangapatana. Thus it was made certain that no ruler could arise in Mysore like Tippu who could intervene in a contest of sea-power or hold out a hand to European enemies of England to give landing for troops which might threaten British power in the South of India as it had been threatened in the days of La Bourdonnaix and Duplex. (2) Similarly Dr. P. B. Desai, an erudite scholar on History of Karnataka, expresses the view: "The wars of Tippu adversely affected the unity of Karnataka. After the second and last war, the three conquering powers, the English, Nizam and Marathas parcelled out the dominions of Mysore and annexed them to their territories. As a
result of these territorial arrangements, which were subsequently slightly altered, Karnataka was vivisected and the Kannada people were drastically disintegrated. The coastal district including Kanara were retained by the English. The north-eastern areas comprising the tracts of Bidar, Gulbarga, and Raichur were handed over to the Nizam. The Northern parts constituting Bijapur, Belgaum and Dharwar Districts were, after the fall of the Marathas, ultimately incorporated in the Bombay Presidency. This division was fraught with dire consequences for the future of the Kannada people.

Karnataka, which for centuries had possessed an individuality, a distinction of its own, with a noble tradition and culture coming down from ancient times, was now split up arbitrarily without any consideration for its oneness. While in the north, Kannadigas lost their position under Maharashtra, those coming under the rule of the Nizam were suppressed under the impact of Muslim language, culture and traditions. Mysore was deprived of the coastal lands and the lack of access to the sea hampered its trade. Coorg, the land of lovely landscape and big games, was restrained by the Britishers as a separate Commissioner's province.

The South-eastern and South-western parts were handed over
to the Madras Presidency and came under the sway of Telugu, Tamil and Malayali linguistic and cultural traditions. Kannadigas, once spread over a large part of South India, now had only the eight Districts of Mysore to nourish their language, culture and traditions under the Maharajas. "(3)

Krishnaraj Wodeyar III (1794 to 1868) was made as the ruler by the Britishers. But he was only a child of five years and so the native State of Mysore came under the supervision and direct protection of the Britishers. "Purnaiah, Tippu's Finance Minister, having surrendered and offered his services, was appointed Dewan to the Maharaja to conduct the administration of the new Government during the Maharaja's minority with Sir Barry Close as Resident."(4)

The Britishers administered the territory up to 1811 through Dewan Purnaiah. When Krishnaraj Wodeyar III became a major and took over the reigns of administration in his own hands in 1811, Purnaiah's Regency was terminated. He remained a pensioner for some time and died in March 1812.

Thus when the Old Princely State of Mysore was
restored to the Wodeyars in 1811, the Britishers became the masters of the remaining portions of Karnataka. They kept the various parts of Karnataka under different administrations to suit their own political ends and consequently the people speaking Kannada language became strangers to each other. The territory of Karnataka was vivisected under nineteen different administrations. They were the provinces of Bombay, Madras and Coorg and the princely States of Mysore, Hyderabad, Kolhapur, Sangli, Miraj (Junior), Miraj (Senior), Kurandwad (Junior), Kurandwad (Senior), Jamakhandi, Mudhol, Ramdurg, Jath, Akalkot, Aundh (Gundal), Sawanur and Sandur (vide map No.1). Consequently, Kannada-speaking people came to be distributed in these princely States and the provinces.

Unification Movement

The disintegration of Karnataka region under different administrative Units became an impediment for the people to come together and to remain as a homogeneous unit. Their arts, education, rich culture and literature were neglected by the erstwhile Governments and Kannadigas gradually lost their identity. Dr. P.B. Desai, an eminent historian further observes: "However, a matter of
great concern that exercised the minds of the thinking men speaking one Kannada language and inheriting the same cultural traditions, was that they had no homogeneous unit of their mother-land. If some of them belonged to Bombay, others were in Madras, a third group in Hyderabad and the fourth in Mysore. Such differences had resulted in unending difficulties, disadvantages and slackness in the matters of administrative and educational facilities, social and economic well-being. The outsiders looked at a Kannada man either as a Marathi, a Madras, a Hyderabad or a Mysorean and never a Kannadiga.” (5)

Thus the healthy development of the language and life of the people were prevented due to lack of self-consciousness and cohesion. The beginnings of the movement for the Unification of Karnataka were seen first in the fields of educational, literary and cultural activities and then they were spread to the political field.

Movement in the Educational Field

Due to the acceleration of communication system and the impact of English education, the people of dismembered Karnataka began to feel the sense of oneness.
Dr. R.S. Mugali, in his book entitled "The Heritage of Karnataka", expresses: "The history of Modern Karnataka begins roughly with the introduction of the new educational system and the teaching of English in the Kannada country. We learn that the Department of Education in Bombay was set up in the year 1823 and schools were opened in the Kannada Districts of the Bombay Presidency as late as 1836. Even then, the language taught in the schools was Marathi. The Government documents were also in Marathi. It was in 1869 that the department realised that the language of these Districts was Kannada. From that year onwards, efforts were made to put education in Bombay-Karnataka on a better footing."(6) Similarly Dr. R.Y. Dharwadkar, in his thesis accepted by Karnataka University, has made a reference to the fact of Marathi schools being opened in the Districts of Dharwar, Karwar, Belgaum and Bijapur of the then Bombay Presidency. He points out: "As early as 1826, two Marathi schools were opened one at Dharwar and other at Hubli."(7) He further observes: "In 1835 two Kanarese schools were opened in the same towns; a third Kanarese school at Rameshwar in 1836."(8) The above four Districts of the Bombay Presidency were constituted into one division for the purpose of educational administration and the division
was known as the southern Division of the Bombay Presidency. Mr. Russell was appointed as the Educational Inspector of this division in 1865. Mr. Venkat Rango Katti, an educationist of those times, has most vividly described the prevailing condition of Kannada in the schools of those days. Dr. D.R. Bhide, Jnanapith Award Winner, has made a reference to the statement of Venkat Rango Katti in his monumental work entitled "Sahtya Samshodhane." He points out: "Before Mr. Russell's appointment, the Division possessed no Kanarese schools of its own except the first three reading books of questionable utility. A translation Exhibitionship was transferred from Poona to this division at the time of Major Waddington and it was held at the time of Mr. Russell's arrival by a Marathi man, who was to prepare Kanarese books for Government schools."(9)

When Mr. Russell took over charge as the Educational Inspector of the Southern Division in 1865, he pointed out to the appalling condition of Kannada being taught in the schools of these Districts. Dr. Srinivas Havanur, in his thesis accepted by Poona University, has made a reference to the description given by Inspector Russell when he took over charge: "The Kanarese language has
never been taught and cultivated in this Division as the Gujarati and Marathi in theirs. ... while in the other Divisions, the means for a good vernacular education are ample, in this Division, Kanarese books (and masters) are only in course of preparation. The vernacular of most of the masters is Kanarese and those whose vernacular is Marathi, generally speak Kanarese also. Still it is unfortunately true that very few, even the native Kanarese themselves can teach their mother tongue in a scholarly manner, most of them cannot even write it respectably to dictation. Many of them even know Marathi better than Kanarese at least for school purposes.... this confusion of two languages and the absence of proficiency in either puts the Southern Division scholars, I fear, some years behind those of the other two Divisions." (10) Dr. Dharwadkar has pointed out, in his thesis, to the Annual Administration Report submitted by Inspector Russell for the year 1965-66: "The Deputy Inspectors and English Masters in this Division are none of them Kanarese and there are very few Kanarese men even among the vernacular school masters in the Districts. The Kanarese language has never been taught or cultivated in this Division as the Gujarati or Marathi in their's.... The indifference
of the Kanarese people in general to schools in which the books and teachers are mostly Marathi can hardly be wondered at. 

Inspector William Russell encouraged Kannada education, by establishing more and more Kannada-medium schools in this Division. He was the first Inspector to encourage Kannada education in the Bombay-Karnataka area. Mr. Nelson Fraser, in his editorial of the periodical entitled "Indian Education" of October 1912, observed: "In one way, Government are responsible for the prevailing state of things in Karnataka. The first two Educational Inspectors in the Southern Division, since the organisation of vernacular education by Mr. E.I. Howard in 1858, were military officers.... At the time Mr. Russell took over charge of the Division, a veritable chaos prevailed in it. The language of the people was Kanarese, but Marathi was taught in schools in preference to the mother-tongue.... Mr. Russell put his foot down and said that the language of the people must be taught to the people.... If he had been succeeded by a fair-minded and upright Englishman, the Karnataka College would have been established more than thirty years ago and His Excellency would have had to think of establishing a University at Dharwar today."
Thus the schools in various parts of Karnataka, with the exception of Mangalore District, had either Marathi, Telugu and Tamil as the medium of instruction. The Court and the official languages were Marathi, Telugu and Tamil. There was not a single institution which aimed at furthering Kannarese language and literature.... The idea of unifying the various parts of Karnataka was not even dreamt of. The people living in various provinces and States, being practically in water-tight compartments, knew little and cared less about Kannarese brethren in other parts of Karnataka.\(^{(13)}\)

A dedicated batch of local patriots and workers of Karnataka rendered their yeoman service in the field of education. Some of them were working in Government service. The boys and girls whose mother-tongue was Kannada were taught Marathi and this injustice was brought to the notice of the Government by the responsible kannada-knowing officers, like Deputy Channabasappa, Dhondo Narasimha Mulbagal, Gangadhar Madivaleshwar Turmari, Venkat Rango Katti, Scvadi Anna Rao, Diwan Bahadur S.K. Rodda and Mr. R.H. Deshpande.\(^{(14)}\) These leaders appealed to the Kannadigas to preserve and cherish Kannada culture, language and traditions. They

Movement in the Literary Field

Kannada language and literature were in a state of confusion and chaos since Kannadigas had been vivisected under different administrations. They were gradually loosing the awareness of the rich heritage of their language and literature. Dr. R.S. Mugali, in the Heritage of Karnataka, expresses the view: "As a result of this dismemberment, there was little contact between the Kannada people of different parts. If any, there was a feeling of aloofness and indifference towards each other. Ignorance about the language, literature and history of Karnataka reigned supreme. The new education in English
gradually gave Karnataka the intellectual background for the vision of a new nationalism, which had arisen in the rest of India. Dr. R.S. Sugali further observes:

"But the British had dismembered Karnataka into several odd parts and thrown it into the hands of those who stood by their side in the struggle for power, thus wiping out the very identity of the land and its people. Quite apart from literature and culture, the survival of Kannada as a language was itself in jeopardy. It became distorted in different ways, subject to the onslaughts of different languages, particularly in the border areas....

Fortunately, however, educated Konnadiyas awakened to a new consciousness, which combined love of India with love of Kannada land and found no contradiction in it. They placed before themselves the ideal of reviving Kannada language, literature and culture. Their passionate love of Kannada spread through every nook and corner, though in initial stage, some of them were dubbed as fanatics and fire-eaters. 'Free India and United Karnataka' became the mantra of the awakened people of the land....

The Karnataka of those days which was split up into several administrative units, came under western influence in varied ways and at different times. South Kanara or Coastline Karnataka which was included in Madras province
then, received the benefit of English education and imbied new ideas earlier than other parts. The educated people of this part developed a new outlook on life and literature. Especially the Christian Missionaries rendered signal service to Kannada though their main purpose was to spread their religion. It is they who gave modern Kannada its script which is now in vogue. It was formed on the basis of the past. It was they who started the first printing press in Kannada. Not only this, they wrote and published works on grammar, prosody and lexicon with the help of Indian scholars in the field. These served as aids to the study of Kannada language and literature. The names of scholars such as Kerry, Maccerrel, Rieve, Kittel, Rice and Cardwell deserve to be remembered with gratitude and veneration, for their contribution to Kannada scholarship in the formative stage. In the Old Mysore State, literary research and publication of old works got under way under royal patronage. The collation and editing of inscriptions was undertaken on a large scale. Lewis Rice brought out several volumes of Epigraphia Carnatica and earned the gratitude of the erudite public. The epigraphs, which these volumes contained, gave to Kannadigas an insight into the history and culture of their land.
In addition to inscriptions, old works both poetical and scientific were published for the first time. It was as if a grand old temple buried underground for centuries together had suddenly come to the surface with all its pristine glory. For the people of the Kannada land, it was a discovery of their rich heritage, evoking feelings of elation and pride. In North Karnataka, it took long for the darkness of the night to disperse. English education was slow to spread and the stranglehold of other dominating languages on the minds of the educated did not loosen soon.... In course of time, the right sort of education in Kannada and English produced a new educated class of people who felt proud of their heritage and dreamt dreams of enriching it with their creative output in modern literary forms. Kannada consciousness was kindled by the Christian Missionaries and European Scholars like G.H. Weigle (1800 to 1890), Reverend Samuel Habich (1803 to 1867), Herman Moegling (1811 to 1881), George Worth (1820 to 1869), Reverend Kiege (1821 to 1870), Reverend Ferdinand Kittel (1832 to 1903), Reverend Frederic Ziegler (1832 to 1906), John Fleet (1847 to 1917), Herman Riesh (1863 to 1928). These persons fired the imagination of the people by their scholarly works on Kannada literature.
like A Practical Key to Kannarese Grammar, A Practical Key to the Kannarese Language and School Dictionary by Ziegler, the voluminous Lexicogra of Kannada-English and vice-versa by Kittel. The people speaking Kannada language did not have any idea of the range of Kannada literature. Because the systematic historical study of Kannada literature had not been undertaken by anybody. But Mr. E. P. Rice, patiently worked and labouriously pieced together the scattered information contained in inscriptions on stone and copper and in the colophons and text of palm-leaf manuscripts about Kannada literature and wrote down a book entitled "A History of Kannarese Literature." He expresses the view: "With the nineteenth century begins an entirely new period of Kannarese literature, brought about by the influence of English rule in India, the impact of European civilization and the introduction of western scientific methods of research and ideals of scholarship. The reorganisation of the education of the country on western lines has largely increased the reading public and extended the knowledge of desire for literature." (18) These works of missionaries opened up the eyes of Kannadigas.
Similarly some of the Kannada scholars living in the various parts of Karnataka awakened the Kannada people by their literary works in the nineteenth century. The literary giants like Gangadhar Madiveleshwar Turnori (1827 to 1877), Sheshagiri Rao Churumuri (1827 to 1884), Venkat Ranga Katti (1833 to 1909), Nanjegud Subbacheri (1934 to 1906), Sham Rao Vithal Kaikini (1841 to 1905), Rasevappa Shastri (1843 to 1891), M.Venkatkrishnayya (1844 to 1934), Savadi Anna Rao (1846 to 1900), Dhondo Narasimha Malbagal (1848 to 1898), Kerki Venkatraman Shastri (1852 to 1892), C.Vasudevaiah (1852 to 1933), Laxman Babani Pai (1853 to 1927), Shant Ravi (1856 to 1926), Garani, Krishnachar (1857 to 1918), M.S. Shastry (1860 to 1939), R.H.Deopande (1861 to 1930), S.G. Narasimhachar (1862 to 1911), M.A. Ramamuj Iyengar (1862 to 1938), Kerur Vasudevacharya (1866 to 1921), Govtrich (1869 to 1918), Galaganath (1869 to 1942), Muddana (1870 to 1901), C.H. Honnapurmath (1870 to 1925), Krishna Rao Mudaveedkar (1874 to 1947), Bengal Ram Rao (1876 to 1943), V.G. Halakatti (1880 to 1964), Alur Venkat Rao (1880 to 1964), Uttangi Channappa (1881 to 1962), M.P. Pujar (1884 to 1962), created awareness of Kannada among the people by their literary works! The services rendered by men of letters like B.M. Srikantiah, B. Shivamurthy Shastri, S.S. Basawanal,
R.H. Diwakar, P.C. Halakatti, Alur Venkat Rao, K.V. Puttappa, Nairgol Nereyan Rao, A.N. Krishna Rao, Durli Bindi Madhev, T.T. Sharma, Siddayya Puranik and Manvi Narasinga Rao, S.V. Ranganna and Shivaram Karanth, during the twentieth century, will go into the immortal records of Unification Movement. The songs composed by K.V. Puttappa (Victory to Thee, Karnataka Mate) and by Nairgol Nereyan Rao (Rise, Our Lovely Kannada Land) inspired the people. Thus these literary men provided the necessary emotional background for the agitation for United Karnataka. All these developments made the people to understand that they were Kannada speaking people. This awareness created a feeling in them that they must have a linguistically homogeneous unit of Kannada speaking people. But as they were under colonial rule, they waited for an opportunity to give ventilation to their political feelings.

Movement in the Cultural Field

The cultural awakening in the different regions of India was one of the effects of the British rule in India. Like other parts of India, Karnataka also witnessed the cultural renaissance. Several organisations and news papers accelerated the cultural awakening. They kindled the spirit of Kannada consciousness among
the people. They worked with devotion and zeal for the cause of Kannada.

The first organisation which came into existence was the Karnataka Vidya Vardhaka Sangh. The local leaders of Dharwar met at a Conference on 20-7-1890 and they established the Karnataka Vidya Vardhaka Sangh on the same day. Mr. R.H. Deshpande played a significant role in the establishment of this organisation. It encouraged the authors who wrote books in Kannada and instituted prizes for the best books of Kannada. It undertook the responsibility of printing and publishing Kannada books. It used to hold elocution competitions in Kannada and established Kannada libraries in the various parts of dismembered Karnataka. In the year 1896, it started a famous monthly journal known as "Vagbhooshan" which rendered a great service to Kannada language and literature for several decades. "The Kanarese dialects and the text-book language in one part of Karnataka were unintelligible to the inhabitants of the other parts. It was therefore felt that the sine qua non for territorial unity is the achievement of the uniformity of the Kanarese language throughout Karnataka." To achieve linguistic uniformity in the spoken and written language of Kannada
In different parts of Karnataka, the Sangh organised a Conference of Kannada authors at Dharwar on 2nd and 3rd June 1907. The second session of the Conference was held at Dharwar on 30-5-1908. The Managing Committee of the Sangh met at Dharwar on 7-10-1917 and passed a resolution urging for the immediate Unification of Karnataka. Thus it created a great awakening among the people of Karnataka.

The second organisation which played a significant role in the cultural renaissance was Kannada Sahitya Parishad. Sir M.Vivekananda thought of holding a Conference of Kannada litterateurs and accordingly it was held at Hassan in 1915. The representatives from different parts of Karnataka attended the Conference and they decided to establish Kannada Sahitya Parishad at Bangalore. It was formed in the year 1915. It provided a platform for the Kannadigas to come together and to exchange their views. The main inspiration or impetus for unification came from the Kannada Sahitya Parishad. It held Conferences of litterateurs at various places. The annual Conferences of the Parishad were presided over by men of letters like:

1) Shri H.V. Nanjundaiah (Bangalore, May 1915),
2) Shri H.V. Nanjundaiah (Bangalore, May 1916),
3) Shri H.V. Nanjundaiah (Mysore, June 1917),
4) Shri R. Narasimhochar (Dharwar, May 1918),
5) Shri Karpoor Shrinivas Rao (Hassan, May 1919),
6) Shri Rodda Shrinivas Rao (Hospet, June 1920),
7) Shri K. P. Puttana Shettaru (Chickmaglur, May 1921),
8) Shri M. Venkata Krishnaiah (Davangere, May 1922),
9) Shri Siddhant Shivashekar Shastri (Bijapur, May 1923),
10) Shri Hoekote Krishna Shastri (Kolar, May 1924),
11) Shri Bengal Ramrao (Belgaum, May 1925),
12) Shri F. G. Halakatti (Bellary, May 1926),
13) Shri R. Tata (Mangalore, May 1927),
14) Shri V. M. Shrikantaih (Gulbarga, June 1928),
15) Shri Masti Venkatesh Iyengar (Belgaum, May 1929),
16) Shri Alur, Venkat Rao (Mysore, October 1930),
17) Shri Muliya Timmapaiah (Karwar, December 1931),
18) Shri D. V. Gundappa (Mangalore, December 1932),
19) Shri Y. Nagesh Shastri (Hubli, December 1933),
20) Shri Panje Mungesh Rao (Raichur, December 1934),
21) Shri N. S. Subba Rao (Bombay, December 1935),
22) Shri Bellave Venkat Narayanappa (Jammkhodi, December 1937),
23) Shri R. R. Diwakar (Bellary, December 1938),
24) Shri Mudavadi Krishna Rao (Belgaum, December 1939),
25) Shri Y. Chandrashekhar Shastri (Dharwar, December 1940),
26) Shri A. R. Krishna Shastri (Hyderabad, December 1941)
27) Shri D.R. Bendre (Shimoga, December 1943),
28) Shri S.S. Basavanal (Rabakavi, December 1945),
29) Shri T.P. Enilasam (Madras, December 1945),
30) Shri K. Venkat Ramaiah (Harpanhalli, May 1917),
31) Shri Tirumale Tatachar Sharma (Kasargod, December 1945),
32) Shri Uttangi Channappa (Gulbarga, March 1949),
33) Shri M.R. Srinivasa Murthy (Sholapur, May 1950),
34) Shri M. Govind Pai (Bombay, December 1951),
35) Shri S.C. Nandimath (Belur, May 1952),
36) Shri V. Seetaramaiah (Kumta, December 1954),
37) Shri Shivaram Karanth (Mysore, June 1955),
38) Shri Adya Rangashar (Raichur, December 1955),
39) Shri K.V. Puttappa (Dharwar, May 1957),
40) Shri V.K. Gokak (Ballary, January 1958),
41) Shri D.L. Narasimhachar (Bidar, February 1960),
42) Shri A.N. Krishna Rao (Manipal, December 1960),
43) Shri K.G. Kundangar (Gadag, December 1961),
44) Shri R.S. Mugali (Siddaganga, December 1963),
45) Shri Kodongodlu Shankar Bhat (Karwar, May 1965),
46) Shri A.N. Upadhye (Shravanbelgola, May 1967),
47) Shri D. Javare Gowda (Bangaluru, December 1970),
48) Smt. Jayadevitali Ligade (Mandya, May 1974),
49) Dr. S.V. Ranganna (Shimoga, December 1976),

The services rendered by these Presidents of the Parishad will go into the immortal records of Unification Movement.
The third organisation which inspired consciousness of Karnataka among the people was Karnataka Unification League. It was established at Dharwar in 1916 to strive for Unification of Karnataka. Mr. Kadapa Raghavendra Rao, Mr. Alur Venkat Rao, Mr. Honnapurmath Gadigeyya, Mr. Nargundkar, Mr. Rajapurochit, Mr. Mudavidkar Venkat Rao, Mr. Mudavidkar Krishna Rao, Mr. S. B. Joshi and Mr. Mangalwadho Shrinivas Rao sponsored the League. They were all nationalists to the core. They strove for unification along with national liberation movement. The Conferences of the League were presided over by eminent leaders like:

1) Rao Bahadur Kambli (Belgaum, 1924),
2) Pandit Rayappa Chikodi (Sollary, 1926),
3) Rao Saheb Halkatti, (Dharwar, 1928),
4) Mr. Ranganath Mudaliar (Belgaum, 1929),
5) Dr. Pattabhi Setteramiah (Hukeri, 1931),
6) Mr. D. V. Salvi (Dharwar, 1933),
7) Dr. Udupi Ramrao (Belgaum, 1936),
8) Mr. K. R. Karanth (Dharwar, 1938),
9) Dr. R. Nagan Gowda (Sholapur, 1940),
10) Mr. B. G. Kher (Bombay, 1946),
11) Mr. R. R. Diwakar (Kasargod, 1947).

The League held in all eleven Conferences at the above
mentioned different places from time to time and reiterated the demand for Karnataka Unification.

Among all the eleven Conferences held at various places, the Tenth Conference held at Bombay in June, 1946, was the most significant. It was presided over by Shri B.G.Khor, the then Chief Minister of Bombay and was inaugurated by Sardar Vallabha Bhai Patel. Declaring open the Conference, Sardar Patel said: "Your case for unification is strong. Even the British Karnataka area in population and size, is larger than the Mysore State and in population twice the size of Sind and about three times the size of North-West Frontier Province. It would be about 20 times the size of Coorg and 40 times its population. A large part of Mysore and Hyderabad is inhabited by Kannada speaking population. If we take these areas, the Kannada speaking unit would be a formidable Linguistic Unit in India. If India is to achieve rapid progress, the linguistic areas must be reorganised into provincial units. I assure you, you will not have to wait long to see a United Karnataka raising out of the scattered Kannada speaking areas with a provincial Government, a University and proud provincial life of its own." (21) Mr. B.G. Khor, in his
presidential address remarked: "I also fully share with you, your genuine aspiration for the unification for the development of our Kannada speaking population which easily exceeds a crore and half. The tract which lies closely packed between the Godavari, the Nilgiris, the Arabian Sea and the Eastern Ghats is inhabited mostly by people speaking one language - the Kannada. Kannada language is extremely rich in literature. If in recent times, it has not been enriched by the production of adequate modern literature, the reason is not difficult to seek. Indeed, this furnishes a strong ground for the unification of the scattered Kannada speaking areas, in one administrative unit, so that their rapid development may not be arrested, as it has been, owing to variety of reasons. You can trace the history of your literature in unbroken descent from the 2nd century B.C. onwards, if not earlier, through the reigns of Kadamba, Pallava, Ganga, Chalukya, Rashtrakutas, Kalachuri, Chola, Hoyeala, Ballala, Yadava, Raya and Wodeyar dynasties. I, however, must not here dilate on the beauties of Kannada literature; suffice it to say that it has a music and charm of its own which are obvious even to the most casual student. It has also a deep religious undertone. It is very significant that Shankar, Ramanuja and Madhwa - all were
born in the South and prospered in Karnataka. amaveera, the founder of Veerashaivism, was also born in Karnataka.\(^{(22)}\)

Thus these three organisations played a prominent role in bringing about a cultural awakening among the people of dismembered Karnataka and reminded them of the rich cultural heritage of Karnataka by organising multifarious activities.

Similarly, in the field of journalism, the Kannada Press responded to the call of the cause and played a significant role by supporting the movement. They were Samyukta Karnataka, Karnaveera, Vishala Karnataka, Nawayuga, Prapancha of Hubli, Sahitya Parishad Patriko, Kantheerava and Kannada Nudi of Mysore, Swatantra Karnataka and Vishala Karnataka of Bangalore, Nava Sandesha of Bellary, Tarura Karnataka of Bailhongal, Jaya Karnataka of Dharwar, Vagbhooshan, Karnataka Vaibhava and Nava Karnataka of Bijapur among the notables.\(^{(23)}\)

**Historical and Geographical Factors of Unification**

The historical and the geographical factors also played a significant role in launching the movement for the Unification of Karnataka. Because a common historical
tradition creates a common consciousness and fosters a sense of kinship and oneness. A common history is a relevant factor to the reorganisation of States.

Some historians reminded the Kannadigas of their glorious history and drew their attention to the rich heritage of Karnataka. The Kannada people of today are indebted to them for their valuable contributions of Epigraphy Carnatica, Mysore and Coorg from Inscriptions by B.L. Rice. Dynasties of Kanarese Districts of Bombay Presidency by J.F. Fleet, A Forgotten Empire by Robert Sewell, The Foundations of Vijayanagar Empire by Father Heras and Karnataka Gatavaibhava by Alur Venkat Rao. These works enabled the Kannadigas living in the areas of Bombay, Hyderabad, Madras, Coorg and Old Mysore to understand their past glory. The sixteenth centenary of Vijayanagar Empire was celebrated at Harpi in 1936 and a commemoration volume depicting the ancient glory, heritage and the great achievements of Karnataka was published on the occasion. It inspired the consciousness of Karnataka among the people.

It will not be out of place to cite here a few facts from the history of Karnataka. Karnataka was a powerful unit among the sub-nations of India from
the earliest period of history. It had occupied a unique place in political institutions, religious and spiritual life, administrative machinery, empire building, literature and fine arts, art and architecture. It had maintained its integrity. This vast territory was reigned by the indigenous rulers of Karnataka: Kauryan and Satevahana Kings (1st Century to 3rd Century A.D.), the Kadambas of Banavasi (325 to 540 A.D.), the Ganges of Talkad (325 to 999 A.D.), the Chalukyas of Badami (500 to 757 A.D.), the Rashtrakutas of Malkhod (735 to 973 A.D.), the Chalukya and Kalachuris of Kalyana (973 to 1198 A.D.), the Hoysalas of Doraamudra (1000 to 1346 A.D.), the Kings of Vijayanagar Dynasties (1336 to 1565), the Kings of Coorg (1633 to 1834) and Wodeyars of Old Mysore (1399 to 1947) speaking Kannada in their homes. Thus it is seen that, of all the provinces of India, Karnataka was the only region which produced the largest number of rulers and governors. It is the region where for more than 2000 years the culture of the Kannada speaking people flourished. A vast portion of Southern India during the days of Vijayanagar Empire, was under the sway of Karnataka till 1565 A.D. The empire had risen to the zenith of glory in the 16th century. But the height of this power was shattered by Mohamadan Invasion on the
battle field of Rokkasagi - Tangadgi in 1565 A.D. Before the British finally took over this territory, they had to fight hard with Hyder Ali and Tippu. With the fall of Tippu in 1799 A.D., the rising wave of consciousness among the Kannada people ebbed. Karnataka played a significant role by contributing philosophies and religion that cut across different castes and languages. Similarly, geographical contiguity is quite essential for administrative convenience. But there is a lot of controversy about the geographical extent of Karnataka. In the ancient period, Karnataka was coterminous with country where Kannada was the spoken language. "It is found that Kannada language was current in the area, at least in and around from the 9th century A.D., bounded on the North by the Godavari, on the East by the Vengi-Vishaya (Guntur and Krishna Districts roughly) of the Eastern Chalukyas, on the South by the Cauvery river and on the West by the Arabian Sea adjoining the strip of Konkan. The Northern and Eastern limits, have in the course of centuries, been pulled down to the Bhima on the North and to the Kurnool and Anantpur Districts on the East. Similarly, the Southern boundary has been pushed, up."(24) In Kuvirajamarga (The Royal Road of the Poets), an earliest extant Kannada work written by Nrpatunga in the year 850 A.D.,
the geographical extent between the Godawari on the North and the Cauvery in the South was taken to comprise the ancient Karnataka. (25) This geographical awareness among the Kannada speaking people created a consciousness that they were geographically homogeneous. But without entering into any controversy about the geographical extent, for the present survey, the present the region bounded by the States of Maharashtra in the North and North-West, Andhra Pradesh in the East, Tamil Nadu in the South-East and South and Kerala in the South-west, is taken to comprise present Karnataka.

Movement in the Political Field

The demand in favour of homogeneous linguistic provinces was being made from time to time on the platform of the Indian National Congress and elsewhere. The provinces in British India were made completely autonomous under the Government of India Act of 1935. Since then, the demand for linguistic provinces became more vocal and more emphatic. It assumed the form of a strong movement in about 1937 when provincial autonomy became a political fact. The Indian National Congress had always stood for the formation of provinces on a linguistic basis and it translated its conviction into
practice by providing for linguistic provinces in its own Constitution which was adopted in 1920. Yet curiously enough, one could trace the beginning of the movement for the Unification of Karnataka from the year 1903 itself. The Indian National Congress had created separate Congress circles for Bihar in 1903, Sind, Orissa and Andhra in 1917, thus indirectly conceding to the idea of formation of linguistic provinces but had failed to respond to the request of Kannadigas for a separate circle. Some of the British administrators had also recognised that Indian provinces were artificially formed. Lord Curzon distinctly held the view and insisted on redistribution and was of the opinion that linguistic provinces promoted administrative convenience. In 1911 Lord Hardinge expressed himself as follows:

"We are satisfied that it is in the highest degree desirable to give the Hindi speaking people, now included within the province of Bengal, a separate administration. These people have been unequally yoked with the Bengalis and have never, therefore, had a fair opportunity for development." (26) In another place he said: "No greater facilities can be given to the people of India than fostering of local patriotism by the construction of a new map on the ethnological and linguistic basis and the
consequent friendly inter racial competition for civilised progress and ultimate autonomy."(27)

The Views of Montford Committee (1918)

Kannadigas had continued their efforts to get for Karnataka a separate Congress circle and got the same incorporated in the Congress Party Constitution. In the meanwhile, the Committee on Indian Constitutional Reforms popularly known as Montagu-Chelmsford Committee submitted its report in 1918. The views of the Committee were quite encouraging to the advocates of Unification. The authors of the Report of the Committee on Indian Constitutional Reforms 1918 dealt with the formation of linguistic provinces. They observed: "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. The actual needs, wishes or affinities of the people were ignored."(28) Recommending for smaller and more homogeneous units, they expressed the view: "We are impressed with the artificial and often inconvenient character of existing administrative units. We have seen how historical reasons brought them about. We cannot doubt 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. We believe emphatically that redistribution of provincial areas cannot be imposed upon the people by official action: and that such a process ought, in any case to follow and neither to proceed nor accompany, Constitutional reform. But we are bound to indicate our clear opinion that wherever such redistributions are necessary and can be effected by process of consent, the attempt to do so should be made: and therefore we desire 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."(29) The Joint Parliamentary Board which considered the Montford Reform Bill also observed: "A measure of responsible Government has been introduced in the nine
Governors' provinces. But these units have been shaped as explained in the Montagu-Chelmsford Report by the military, political or administrative exigencies or conveniences of the moment and with small regard to the natural affinities or wishes of the people. Several provinces present features rivaling in their heterogeneity, to India herself, the population of three of them, Madras, Bengal and the United Provinces exceed 40 millions. We admit that, for administrative purposes when several units are subordinated to a Central Unit, it is desirable that a number of such units should be small. We are, however, now considering the difficulties in the working of responsible Government in India and we feel that those difficulties are certainly enhanced by reason of the large sizes of the provinces, their artificial and unnatural boundaries and the heterogeneity in their population.

The Session of the Indian National Congress was held at Nagpur in 1920. Shri Kadapa Raghavendra Rao toured all the parts of Karnataka and led the delegates to the Congress Session. "The Session under the Presidentship of Mahatma Gandhi decided to accept the principle of linguistic provinces and divided the country into 21 Congress circles, on the basis of language."
got a separate Congress circle with headquarters at Gadag." "In the same year, the leaders of Karnataka Sabha (Karnataka Unification League) had organised the first Karnataka Political Conference at Dharwar under the Presidencieship of Shri V.P. Madhava Rao, Ex-Dewan of Mysore." (32) It unanimously passed a resolution demanding for the Unification of Karnataka as a separate linguistic province. The years from 1921 to 1924 were the years of Non-cooperation. There was a lull on the Unification front. The Session of the Indian National Congress was held at Belgaum in 1924 under the Presidency of Mahatma Gandhiji and the arrangements for the same had been made under the able guidance of Mr. Gangadhar Rao Doshi. Mr. Kadapa was quite aware of this situation and hence he organised the first Conference of Karnataka Unification League under the Presidency of Rao Bahadur Kambli. A detailed reference has already been made about the role played by the League in respect of the movement in the cultural field. The Coorg Zamindar's Conference passed resolutions (33) successively in 1926, 1927 and 1928 demanding Unification. The Veerashaiva Mahasabha held in 1927 at Bangalore also passed a similar resolution. (34)
The Views of Nehru Committee (1928)

The Committee to determine principles of the Constitution for India was appointed by the All Parties Conference at its meeting held at Bombay in May 1928. The Report of the Committee was submitted in 1928. The Report is popularly known as the Nehru Committee Report named after its Chairman Pandit Motilal Nehru. The authors of the Nehru Committee, testified to the strong position of the future Karnataka province in the following words: "The case for Karnataka was placed before us by a representative of the Karnataka Unification Sangh and the Karnataka Provincial Congress Committee. It had been ably prepared with a wealth of information, historical, cultural and statistical. All our questions were answered satisfactorily and in our opinion a strong prima facie case for unification and the formation of Karnataka as a separate province was made. Parts of the Karnataka lie in Indian States, notably Mysore and there are obvious practical difficulties in the way of uniting those with the rest. It might also not be convenient to unite the small islands of Karnataka on the other side of Mysore territory as those would be cut off from Karnataka proper by Mysore. But even so sufficiently large area remains. We informed
that the demand for unification came from the vast majority of the population, if not practically all. There was no Hindu-Muslim problem but there was a Brahmin-non-Brahmin problem although this did not affect the question of unification much. There was no organised opposition although a small number of Brahmins were opposed. On behalf of the Maharastrians in some of the border districts, a fear was expressed that their language might suffer, but safeguards for this might be provided for. 

The Committee further observed: "Our colleague, Mr. M. S. Aney, does not wholly agree with our now point regarding Karnataka. He was unfortunately not present at the sitting of the Committee when this question was considered with the help of the representative from Karnataka. Mr. Aney is of opinion that the opposition may be greater than we imagine and they may not have approached us as they did not know that we were considering the question. This is hardly likely as the press of Karnataka had been full of this question and considerable publicity had been given to Karnataka representation to our Committee. If anybody felt keenly enough in opposition to this demand, we think that they would certainly have informed us of their views."
We cannot, of course, decide this question finally and we feel that the advocates of unification have prima facie established their right to it. We cannot suggest the exact limits of the new province. It may be that some of the border tracts are bilingual and an enquiry will have to be made on the spot. This work will have to be done by an expert Committee. Messrs. Aney and Pradhan refrain from expressing any opinion on this subject. 

(37) Emphasising the desirability of creating the linguistic provinces, the Nehru Committee expressed: "Everyone knows that the present distribution of provinces in India has no rational basis. It is merely due to accident and the circumstances attending the growth of the British power in India. As a whole, it has little to do with geographical or historical or economic or linguistic reasons. Even from the purely administrative point of view, it is not a success. It is clear that there must be a redistribution of provinces. But small or large, the question of redistribution has to be tackled. What principles should govern this redistribution? Partly geographical and partly economic and financial, but the main considerations must necessarily be the wishes of the people and the linguistic unity of the area concerned. It is well recognised that rapid
progress in education as well as in general culture and in most departments of life depends on language. If a foreign language is the medium of instruction, business, affairs, the life of the country must necessarily be stunted. No democracy can exist where a foreign language is used for those purposes. A democracy must be well informed and must be able to understand and to follow public affairs in order to take an effective part in them. It is conceivable that a democracy can do this if a foreign language is largely used. It becomes essential therefore to conduct the business and politics of a country in a language which is understood by the masses. So far as the provinces are concerned, this must be the provincial language. The Committee further observed: "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 in 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 tradition and literature. In a linguistic area all these factors will help in the
general progress of the province. The National Congress recognised this linguistic principle 8 years ago and since then, so far as the congress machinery is concerned, India has been divided into linguistic provinces."

They further remarked: "Another principle which must govern a redistribution of provinces is the wishes of the people concerned. We, who talk of self-determination on a larger scale cannot, in reason, deny it to a smaller area, provided, of course, this does not conflict with any other important principles or vital question. The mere fact that the people living in particular area feel that they are a unit and desire to develop their culture is an important consideration even though, there may be no sufficient historical or cultural justification for their demand. Sentiment in such matters is often more important than fact. Thus we see that the two most important considerations in rearranging provinces are the linguistic principle and the wishes of the majority of the people. A third consideration, though not of the same importance is administrative convenience, which would include the geographical position, the economic resources and the financial stability of the area concerned. But administrative convenience is often
Referring to the claims of various unification movements they stated: "Demands have been made from time to time for the separation of Andhra, the Telugu area, of Utkal, of Karnataka, Kerala, Sind, Central Provinces and other parts and all these will have to be enquired into and carefully considered when a general redistribution is taken in hand. We have no material before us to give any opinion about most of these areas. We have received no representation except in regard to Karnataka and Sind." (41)

The Committee further observed: "It is unfortunate that although the separation of Sind has given rise to a great deal of heated arguments, we are yet not in possession of all the relevant facts, such as were placed before us by the representative from Karnataka. We would commend the way the Karnataka case was prepared, with patient thoroughness, maps and statistics to those who have demanded the separation of Sind." (42)

The Views of Simon Commission (1920)

The question of redistribution of provinces was also examined by the Indian Statutory Commission, popularly
known as the Simon Commission which submitted its report in 1930. Speaking of the factors which should govern redistribution, the Simon Commission stated: "There is a considerable body of opinion in India which calls for some readjustments of boundaries and redistribution of areas and we entirely share the views of those who think that the present arrangement is not altogether satisfactory. The existing provincial boundaries in one more than one case embrace areas and peoples of no natural affinity and sometimes separate those who might under a different scheme be more naturally united. 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, coastline 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."(43)
Expressing his opinion on the Simon Commission's proposal, Lord Irwin explained how he could change the present provincial boundaries and create new provinces. He said: "It would be for the new administrations themselves to take up such cases as they arise.

Provision will have to be made in the Constitution Act for this purpose. We think that the actual alteration of boundary should be carried out by an Order in Council, but the initiative should come from the provinces concerned and should receive the concurrence of the Central Government and the legislature. It is possible that in future, it may be found desirable to constitute new Governors' Provinces either by a sub-division or amalgamation of existing areas, we think that power to create a new Governor's Province should be referred to the Crown and to Parliament but that appropriate provision should be made in the Constitution Act to ensure that the provinces affected are given adequate opportunities for expressing their views." (44) It is because the British Government recognised the urgency of the redistribution of provinces, a provision was made in 1935 Act to create new provinces under Section 290. Even the Government of India Act 1919 had provided for powers to redistribute provinces in its Section 60.
The Views of O’Donnel Committee (1932)

In the meanwhile, the Government of India appointed a Committee in 1931 under the chairmanship of Sir Samuel O’Donnel to examine and to report on the administrative, financial and other consequences of setting up a separate administration for the Oriya-speaking people and to make recommendations regarding its boundaries in the event of separation. The Committee observed:

"The creation of a province of Orissa will undoubtedly stimulate the demand for a revision of provincial boundaries on linguistic and racial lines: it will encourage the Telugus to press their demand for an Andhra province and may revive or create similar demands on behalf of other communities linked by ties of race and language. It is not for us to say whether such claims can or should be conceded. But the encouragement which they will receive is probably the most important consequence that the formation of the new province will entail." (45) In the Memorandum submitted by the Maharaja of Jeypore to the Orissa Committee, dated the 24th December 1931, he stated: "The desire for provincial redistribution linguistic lines is perfectly legitimate one and has been recognised by the Government on several occasions. In view of the coming Constitutional
developments based on federation, this desire has acquired a new impetus and emphasis. The existing provincial distribution is largely due to historical accidents and rational redistribution on ethnological and linguistic basis, will largely foster a feeling of kinship in the units forming federation, conducing to their solidarity and organic development and bringing about greater cohesion among the units and contributing to the firmness of the national Government as a whole.

Events Between 1936 and 1946

In 1936, Sind was separated from the Presidency of Bombay and formed into a separate province and similarly the province of Orissa was created in 1936 by joining together the Oriya-speaking areas of the provinces of Bihar, Central Provinces and Madras under the provisions of the Government of India Act 1935. In these cases, linguistic homogeneity and wishes of the people were taken into consideration. In 1937, in eight of the eleven provinces of India, the Congress Ministries assumed power. As a result, the sanction of linguistic provinces assumed immediate importance. The Indian National Congress had already recognised the principle of linguistic provinces in 1920 and had even carried it out
into practice by having such provinces in its own Party Constitution. Indian political leaders had always recognised that a self-governing India could never be a Unitary State. Representation was made by the then political leaders of Karnataka to Gandhiji at Wardha to see that a separate Karnataka province was formed. They held that a common language mainly contributed to territorial and cultural homogeneity and on that basis the new provinces must be built if the benefits of political freedom were to be realised. It was of no use to maintain multi-lingual and heterogeneous provinces. In September 1937, Mahatma Gandhiji expressed at Wardha: "The creation of Karnataka as a separate province cannot be resisted on merits. Therefore, whoever brings in a resolution to that effect should be welcomed by the Congress Ministry and difficulties of immediate execution frankly pointed out. The Congress Ministry can take the wind out of the opposition's sails by announcing its policy, means and ways."(47) In October 1937, at its Calcutta Session the All India Congress Committee pronounced(48) its policy regarding the linguistic provinces and recommended to the Madras and Bombay Governments to consider the formation of separate Andhra and Karnataka Provinces respectively. In July 1938, the Congress Working
Committee at Wardha gave an assurance to the deputations from Andhra, Kerala, and Karnataka that the linguistic redistribution of provinces would be taken up by the Congress when it had the power to do so. In the same year, the Madras Legislative Assembly passed a resolution in favour of the creation of the province of Andhra. In the Central Provinces Legislative Assembly a resolution was passed in the same year in favour of the creation of a province called "Mahasidharbha" for the Marathi speaking areas. The Congress party being in power, it had to consider seriously these pressing demands. Hitherto, the Congress had adopted linguistic provinces both in principle and in practice so far as the administration of the Indian National Congress was concerned. The question now was to bring it into practice in the administration of the country itself. But all of a sudden, the Second World War broke out in 1939 and all the Congress Ministries in the provinces resigned protesting against the policy of India's involvement in the Second World War by the British Government. There was silence on the Unification front upto 1944 on account of the outbreak of Second World War. The normalcy was restored in 1944 after the War and again the Unification activities started. The Congress Election Manifesto of 1949-46 reassured the formation of linguistic provinces.
In July 1946, the Raja of Sandur addressing the members of his State Legislature, made a statement to the effect: "You are well aware that many important changes are to take place in Indian affairs. In those changes, the States will have a voice in determining the form of Government India should have. Sandur also must take its part in the interests of India and to safeguard its own interest as well, and it has to find a place for itself when the coming Indian Government has taken final shape. What place Sandur shall have depends on us. But before that, we should know what reality lies in the womb of futurity. Even now there are many knotty points in British India awaiting solution e.g., Grouping of provinces. Are the provinces to be redistributed on a linguistic basis? Is India to be divided into Hindu and Muslim India? We do not favour the partition of India. However, we are favourably inclined towards linguistic redistribution of provinces. Especially, we are interested in the formation of Karnataka Province. It should be said that sufficient attention has not been given till now to this question."(50) In August 1946, the All Karnataka Convention jointly sponsored by the Karnataka Unification League and the Karnataka Provincial Congress Committee was held at Davangere. The Convention
declared: "Without prejudice to the immediate formation of Karnataka Province consisting of the British Karnataka areas, this Convention of the representatives of Karnataka including the British Karnataka States, hereby declares that allround development would not be achieved without a common Government - Federal or otherwise, without distinction of British Karnataka or State Karnataka - Kannada people. To facilitate such a common Government for the whole of Karnataka this Convention is of the opinion that it is absolutely necessary to establish democratic and responsible Government in all the native States and further requests the rulers of those States to co-operate with us in this task. This Convention strongly urges the Constituent Assembly to take up the important question of the formation of provinces on linguistic basis and to take immediate steps to constitute into separate provinces."(51)

The Views of Dar Commission (1943)

The Constituent Assembly of India began to function in December 1946. During 1946 and 1947 things marched on with electric speed, bringing great political transformation in its wake. In accordance with the scheme of the three British Cabinet Ministers, the Constituent
Assembly came into being. When India became independent on 15th August 1947, a Linguistic Provinces Commission popularly known as the Bar Commission was appointed by the President of the Constituent Assembly to examine and report on the formation of new provinces of Andhra, Karnataka, Kerala and Maharashtra and on the administrative, financial and other consequences of the creation of such new provinces. The Commission submitted its report in December 1948. The Commission pointed out: "The strength of the demand for linguistic provinces lies in the fact that there is some advantage in imparting education in working the legislature and in administration if a large majority of the people speak the same language and in fact that these linguistic groups do not seem to live happily in the existing provinces and are anxious to separate. The demand received added force from the fact that a great several of the existing provinces more or less possess linguistic homogeneity. That one part of the country is linguistically homogeneous, including the small province of Orissa which has to be maintained by subvention from the Centre is a source of constant irritation to linguistically heterogenous provinces. It certainly does not lie in the mouth of those who are living in a linguistically
homogeneous province to point its evils to those living in a heterogeneous province. Moreover, the formation of linguistic province has been an article of faith in the current political thought of the country during the last thirty years and has received the support of the Congress and the blessings of Mahatma Gandhi." (52) It further added to the effect: "No doubt, it is a fact that in some of the existing provinces, linguistic homogeneity exists and this is a source of constant irritation to the other linguistic groups who are living in heterogeneous provinces. As soon as India has been physically and emotionally integrated, the Indian State problem solved and the national sentiment strengthened, the scientific planning of the existing provinces of India can be taken in hand as far as practicable and this invidious distinction obliterated; but till then it has to be accepted as an accident of history and all sub-national tendencies in the existing linguistic provinces should be suppressed." (53)

The Commission recorded the following conclusions:

A) "The formation of provinces on exclusively or even mainly linguistic considerations is not in the larger interests of the Indian nation and should not be taken in hand."
B) The problems do not call for an immediate reformation of provinces. As soon as Indian States have been integrated and the country has stabilised itself and other conditions are favourable, they may be reformed and convenient administrative provinces set up.

C) In the formation of new provinces, whenever such a work is taken in hand, oneness of language may be one of the factors to be taken into consideration, along with others; but it should not be the decisive or even the main factor. Generally speaking, bilingual Districts in border areas, which have developed an economic and organic life of their own should not be broken up and should be disposed of on considerations of their own special needs.

D) Reluctantly but definitely, that the case against linguistic provinces is the sounder of the two. *(54)*

The Views of J.V.P. Committee (1949)

The Parm Commission expressed itself strongly against any reorganisation being undertaken in the prevailing circumstances. There was universal condemnation of the
Commission's report especially in Karnataka and Andhra. To assuage public feelings, 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 and to examine the question in the light of the decision taken by the Congress in the past and the requirements of the existing situation:

i) in view of the report of the Bar Commission;

ii) the new problems that have arisen out of the achievement of independence.

The Committee popularly known as the J.V.P. Committee consisted of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel and Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya. The Committee pointed out: "The Congress had given the seal of its approval to the general principle of linguistic provinces. The Congress approval of this principle was partly due to the artificial manner in which existing provinces had been created by the British power in India. It was chiefly due to a desire to have, as far as possible, homogeneous cultural units which would presumably advance more rapidly because of this homogeneity."(55). It further observed "Nevertheless, if there is a strong
and widespread feeling in an area for a linguistic province, a democratic Government must ultimately submit to it, unless there is grave danger to the State and unless this feeling comes into conflict with a rival feeling. If there is general content and willingness, then, of course, the difficulties are much less. Thus the Constitution of a Province of Maharashtra inevitably raises the problems of Karnataka and makes a separate Karnataka Province, with or without Mysore, inescapable.\textsuperscript{(56)} The Commission stated further: "Taking a broad and practical view, therefore, we feel that the present is not an opportune time for the formation of new provinces. It would unmistakably retard the process of consolidation of our gains, dislocate our administrative, economic and financial structure, let loose, while we are still in a formative State, forces of disruption and disintegration and seriously interfere with the progressive solution of our economic and political difficulties. Notwithstanding what we have said above, if public sentiment is insistent and overwhelming, the practicability of satisfying public demand with its implications and consequences must be examined."\textsuperscript{(57)} The Committee concluded: "We feel that the conditions that have emerged in India since the
achievement of independence are such as to make us view
the problem of linguistic provinces in a new light. The
first consideration must be the security, unity, and
economic prosperity of India and every separatist and
disruptive tendency should be rigorously discouraged.
Therefore, the old Congress policy of having linguistic
provinces can only be applied after careful thought
being given to each separate case and without creating
serious administrative dislocation or mutual conflicts
which would jeopardize the political and economic
stability of the country. 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 dis-
tracted by this question. However, if public sentiment
is insistent and overwhelming, we, as democrats, have
to submit to it, but subject to certain limitations in
regard to the good of India as a whole and certain
conditions which we have specified above."(58)

Events Between 1949 and 1953

There was a revolutionary change in the setup of
the provinces of New India immediately after the transfer
of power. The architects of New India had to face the
menacing problem of former princely States. It was on account of the herculean efforts made by the late Sardar Vallabhbhai Patol that it was smoothly solved. When the princely States were integrated, Karnataka came to be amalgamated into five different administrations known as Bombay-Karnataka, Hyderabad-Karnataka, Madras-Karnataka, Old Mysore and Coorg. (vide map No.2).

The New Constitution of India came into force with effect from 26th January 1950. The question of Linguistic Provinces became a live issue at the time of General Elections in 1952. When the general elections were over, the Congress was returned to power. But it took no initiative for the formation of linguistic provinces. Hence Shri Potti Sriramulu, an Andhra leader, undertook a fast unto death in October 1952 to force the Government to form Andhra State and died on 15th December 1952 after 58 days of fasting. This was followed by disturbances causing immense loss to Government property worth Rs.10 millions. The then Prime Minister, the late Pandit Nehru, announced on 19th December 1952 in the Parliament that Government had decided to establish an Andhra State consisting of the Telugu-speaking areas out of the present Madras State. The Government of India appointed in January 1953 Mr. K. N. Wanchoo, Chief
Justice of Rajasthan High Court, to consider and report on the financial and other implications relating to the creation of the New Andhra State, and the questions to be considered in implementing it. He submitted his report in February 1953.

The Views of Wanchoo Committee (1953)

The first question which called for his decision was the extent of boundaries of the new State. The new State of Andhra was to be carved out of the twelve Districts of the Madras State. There was a controversy about Bellary District. In dealing with the Bellary District, Mr. Justice Wanchoo found it difficult to take a definite decision because the District had a predominantly Kannada population in certain areas and similar Telugu population in other areas. Justice Wanchoo could not consider this claim in view of the fact that his enquiry was concerned only with the formation of Andhra State out of the existing State of Madras. However, he recommended: "It is urged that the whole of the Bellary District should be included in Andhra territory till such time as a Karnataka State consisting of predominantly Kannada-speaking people was formed." (59) But he felt that his recommendation was likely to be opposed by the Kannadigas.
Therefore, he added: "There is, however, strong opposition to this course from the Kanarese speaking area of the Bellary District. It seems to me, that the better course would be to include the whole of the Bellary District in the new State rather than in the residuary State. Further, this area may be assured that if and when the Karnataka State is formed, it will be put in that State."

He further suggested to the effect: "An alternative solution would be to separate the three Talukas of Alur, Adoni and Rayadurg here and now. Rayadurg could be added to the District of Anantpur while Alur and Adoni could be added to the District of Kurnool. The remaining seven Talukas will be predominately Kanarese. This District may be administered by the new State but with proper safeguards for its language and culture. This solution would also be opposed by the Kanarese speaking part of the District whose claim is that the Census figures of 1951 are incorrect and that the Adoni, Alur and Rayadurg Talukas are also predominantly Kanarese. It is not, however, possible for me to overlook the Census figures of 1951 and if the District as a whole cannot remain in the new State, the three Talukas of Adoni, Alur and Rayadurg must be separated and put in the new State and added to Kurnool and Anantpur Districts as already pointed out."
The Decision of the Government of India (1955)

On 25th March 1955, the then Prime Minister, the late Pandit Nehru announced in Parliament the decision of the Government of India as follows:

(a) "that the District of Bellary will not be treated as a single unit for the purpose of attachment to any of the two States;

(b) that three of its ten Talukas namely Adoni, Alur and Rayadurg which had a large majority of Telugu speaking people, shall form part of Andhra State; and

(c) that the other Talukas, with the exception of Bellary Taluka, which had a very large Kannada speaking population, shall form part of the State of Mysore." (62)

The decision of the Government of India was deferred in respect of Bellary Taluka in view of its very mixed population and certain other matters. In April 1953, Chief Justice Mr. L. S. Misra of the Hyderabad High Court was appointed to enquire into the various factors regarding the future of Bellary Taluka and to report thereon. He submitted his report in May 1953.
Mr. Justice Misra, in his report, said as follows: "When I commenced the enquiry, I was informed that the Census Superintendent of Madras was still functioning and had in his possession not only original compilations and tabulation statements of 1951 Census but also the original Census slips from which it was possible to get all relevant details for the purpose of this enquiry. These records were of paramount importance, for, though initially the language figures published by the Census Superintendent were only Districtwise, tractwise, figures were later to be included in a Census Handbook which is still in press. The Officer in charge of the operation was, however, good enough to send me its proof copy. It appeared from this Handbook that the rural area of Bellary Taluka was treated as a separate tract for the purpose of sorting of data and Bellary city was likewise classed separately. The precise language composition of Bellary Taluka including the city could thus be ascertained without much difficulty. In order to ensure complete accuracy, a resorting of the census slips of Bellary Taluka villagewise, was carried out with the aid of Shri Arputhanathan, the Census Superintendent of Madras, after obtaining the necessary orders in that behalf from
the Census Commissioner of India. There was cent per cent rechecking for the purpose of this enquiry and this was done through the agency of specially selected sorters who were men of high calibre. A similar resorting of the Bellary tract was also undertaken. The Census Superintendent personally guided and supervised both operations and the fresh figures which were thus obtained are but for slight inevitable variations, in substantial accord with the previous results and therefore, absolutely trustworthy."(63) He further remarked to the effect:

"The figures show an overwhelming predominance of Kannadiga population in Bellary Taluka as a whole. So far, therefore, as the language composition is concerned, I am clear that the Kannadigas have an absolute majority in the Taluka. Coming to the villages, it would be found from the Census figures of 1951 that of the 89 villages in the Taluka, there are only 10 villages in which Telugus are in absolute majority and 5 villages in which Teluga proportion exceeds Kannada but is not over 50 per cent of the total population."(64) He further maintained to the effect: "Having examined the question of allocation of Bellary Taluka from the view point of linguistic composition, administrative convenience, financial implications, economic stability, cultural affinity and
historical background, I would next like to examine the history of the controversy relating to Bellary Taluka which is not without significance. The dispute arose for the first time in the twenties of this century after the formation of linguistic provinces by the Indian National Congress for its organisational functions. Both Andhra and Karnataka Provincial Congress Committees claimed the whole of Bellary District and the Congress Working Committee appointed an Arbitration Committee in 1921 to settle this dispute. Shri N.G. Kelkar, who finally gave an award, allotted Adoni, Alur and Rayadurg Taluks to the Andhra Committee and the rest of the District including Bellary city, to Karnataka Provincial Congress Committee. There was controversy over Bellary city but Shri Kelkar decided to give it to Karnataka Committee, with the remaining Taluka as he came to the conclusion, after examining the census figures, that Bellary Taluka was a predominantly Kannada area. The matter again came before the Partition Committee appointed by the Madras Government in 1949. This Committee consisted of Honourable Chief Minister of Madras, four other ministers and three members of the Constituent Assembly:

1) Honourable Shri P.S.Kumarswamy Raja, Premier (Chairman);
2) Shri M.Bhaktavatsalam, Minister;
3) Shri K. Madhava Menon, Minister;
4) Shri B. Gopal Reddi, Minister;
5) Shri H. Sanjeeva Reddi, Minister;
6) Shri Kala Venkat Rao, M.C.A.;
7) Shri T. Prakasam, M.C.A.;
8) Shri T. T. Krishnamachari, M.C.A.

There were thus four outstanding Andhra leaders and four non-Andhra on the Committee. The members were unanimous in accepting the Kelkar Award regarding Bellary Taluka without any reservations and the Madras Government too in forwarding the report to the Government of India recommended the allocation of the Bellary Taluka to the Kannada portion of the Bellary District. Similar recommendations were made by Shri Justice Wanchoo. It is a little surprising in this context to find that a controversy which should have been completely set at rest by the above decisions, has been raised again in a vehement and bitter form and even the Andhra leaders who previously signed the Partition Committee Report have thought fit to make a demand for Bellary city and the Bellary Taluka. The Kannada leaders therefore bitterly complain and not without justification they say that a dispute which had already found its burial, should not have been allowed to be unearthed at this late stage.
From what has been said above, it follows that Bellary taluka should go as a whole to the State of Mysore subject to the transitional arrangements.\textsuperscript{65}

\textbf{Appointment of States' Reorganisation Commission (1953)}

A bill providing for the formation of the Andhra State was passed by the Indian Parliament in August 1953 and Andhra State came into existence on 1st October 1953. The recommendations of Misra Committee were accepted by the Government of India and accordingly seven talukas of Bellary district namely Harapanahalli, Hadagali, Hospet, Eudligi, Sandur, Siruguppa and Bellary were transferred to Old Mysore State and the remaining three talukas of Adoni, Alur and Rayadurg were transferred to Andhra. The creation of Andhra as a separate linguistic province was a great impetus to other provinces and intense agitation was launched throughout the country. There was much resentment in Karnataka. Shri A.J. Doddemol had started the fast and Shri Shankargowda Patil had gone on fast unto death. The situation in Karnataka had become explosive. At last, the then Prime Minister, the late Pandit Nehru made an announcement in the Parliament on 22nd December 1953, regarding the appointment of the High Power Commission known as the States'}
Reorganisation Commission consisting of Shri Syed Fazl Ali as Chairman, Dr. Fridayanath Kunzru and Sardar K.D. Panikkar as members. The following is the relevant portion of the resolution outlining the broad principles which should govern the consideration of the problem:

"The language and culture of an area have undoubted importance as they represent a pattern of living which is common in that area. In considering a reorganisation of States, however, there are important factors which have also to be borne in mind. First essential consideration is the preservation and strengthening of unity, and security of India. Financial, economic and administrative considerations are almost equally important not only from point of view of each State but also 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 interests." (66)

The States' Reorganisation Commission submitted its report on 30th September 1955 and it was published on 10th October 1955.

The Views of States' Reorganisation Commission (1955)

The Commission refused to recognise language as the sole basis of reorganisation. It stressed upon other
factors also. It laid down four basic principles to govern reorganisation:

A) "Preservation and strengthening of unity and security of India;

B) Linguistic and cultural homogeneity;

C) Financial, economic and administrative considerations; and

D) Successful working of the national plan."

The Commission further cautioned against the monistic approach to the problem and pointed out: "The problems of reorganisation vary from region to region. It has to be kept in mind that the inter-play for centuries of historical, linguistic, geographical, economic and other factors has produced peculiar patterns in different regions. Each case has its own background. Besides, the problems of reorganisation are so complex that it would be unrealistic to determine any case by a single yardstick alone. All the Committees and Commissions which have previously gone into the matter such as the Dar Commission and the J.V.P. Committee have rightly expressed themselves against a monistic approach to the problem." (68)

The Commission examined all the cases on individual merits and the conclusions were reached on the totality of circumstances. The case of Karnataka for unification
has been dealt with by the Commission in its report from paragraphs 320 to 358. The main recommendations of the Commission may be summarised as follows in the words of its report: "It has been generally recognised that, in the provincial distribution under the British, the Kannadigas suffered most, with their areas 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 recognised the legitimacy of the claim of the Kannadigas to unification. The Bar Commission also expressed the view that the Kannadigas would prosper and be able to manage their affairs much better under their own Government if such a Government were possible."(69) The Commission further observed that the Karnataka State should comprise the following areas:

a) "The present Mysore State, excluding the following 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 headworks of
the Tungabhadra project are situated (details of the area to be transferred from the Mallapuram Sub-Taluka will have to be determined by the Government of India, in consultation with the State Governments concerned).

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 Kasargod Taluka;

e) The Kollegal Taluka of the Coimbatore District of Madras; and

f) Coorg.

The territorial limits of Karnataka, as thus proposed, broadly cover the Kannada speaking areas, but in the case of one or two small units, linguistic considerations have been subordinated to other compelling reasons. Some explanation of the reasons why particular areas have been included in or excluded from the Karnataka State is necessary. The Commission further expressed: "The arguments which have been advanced in favour of maintaining
the status quo with regard to Bellary are almost similar
to those advanced for separating the Kolar District from
and not including parts of the Belgaum District in the
future Karnataka State. As we have explained elsewhere,
the linguistic consideration only, should not, in our
view, be the decisive factor, especially in settling
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
in the cumulative effect of three main considerations,
namely, administrative convenience, economic links and
the importance of Tungabhadra project to the Rayalaseema
Districts of Andhra.”(71)

The report of the Commission was generally welcomed
by all sections of the people since it substantially met
the aspirations of Kannadigas. But the strange and
indisensible recommendation regarding the Bellary District
that the Talukas of Siruguppa, Bellary and Hospet with a
small area of Mallapuram Sub-Taluka in which the dam and
head works of Tungabhadra project are situated, be
excluded from the Karnataka State, created a storm among
the Kannadigas. Karnataka had to fight again for Bellary.
Ultimately, the Central Government decided to include
Bellary District in Karnataka and the decision regarding the same was incorporated in the States' Reorganisation Bill 1955. The curtain on the protracted controversy of Bellary District which lasted for 35 years, was, at last, drawn once for ever by the passage of the bill by both the Houses of Parliament.


Economic Aspect of Unification

While considering the question of the formation of United Karnataka on a linguistic basis, so far, political aspect of the movement has been mentioned. It is quite necessary to examine the economic and financial aspects of Unification of Karnataka. Because the demand for linguistic states does not represent mere cultural
revivalism. Economic and financial considerations are quite relevant to any scheme of redistribution of territories. It is quite essential that every reorganised State must be manageable in size and population and must be homogeneous with resources sufficient to carry out its development programmes. Financial viability is an important criterion bearing on the reorganisation of States. As far as possible, the newly formed units should be self-supporting. The States' Reorganisation Commission defined the concept of financial viability in paragraph 172 of their report: "The term 'viable' is generally understood to be 'capable of living, or existing or developing'. The two cardinal concepts of viability would, therefore, appear to be:

a) maintenance; and

b) growth.

Translated into financial terms, these concepts would imply that a State should have adequate financial resources to maintain itself and to develop its economy. In other words, financial viability has two aspects: the short-term aspect is the ability of the State to balance its budget over a period of time, not necessarily within each single financial year; the long-term aspect
is the capacity of the State to increase its economic
resources in such a way that it is possible for it to
balance its budget at a higher level of development,
unless it chooses, on grounds of economic policy, to
have a deficit budget." (72) In order to translate
these general ideas into working principles, the State's
Reorganisation Commission set out certain tests of
financial viability in paragraph 176 of their report:
"It seems to us that a unit to be regarded as financially
self-supporting should be able to meet the following
broad tests:

i) on the average and over a reasonably short
period, a State's revenue and expenditure should be in
balance - unless a deficit is deliberately being planned
as a part of wider economic policy for the country as a
whole; this balanced budget standard is to be attained
after providing in full for servicing the State's public
debt, including all the loans obtained from the Centre;

ii) consistently with (i), the State should be
able to afford such increases as are necessary in the
expenditure on productive and nation-building services
which are legitimately within the State sphere, e.g.
the extension of community projects. No All India standards
can, of course, be prescribed, but it should be possible for each State to set apart progressively more and more funds for development purposes; and

iii) no State should be dependent on the Centre to such an extent as to cause any embarrassment either to itself or to the Centre."(73)

Certain doubts and apprehensions were expressed by certain Committees and the legislators as to whether United Karnataka would be financially self-supporting and economically sound. In this connection, it will be better to examine their views expressed on the pros and cons of economics of Karnataka Unification.

The Views of Nehru Committee (1928)

"Finanically the position of Karnataka was very strong and even at present there was a considerable surplus in the British part of Karnataka."(74)

The Views of Sheshadri Committee (1954)

When the question of reorganisation of States was still under examination of the States' Reorganisation Commission, the Government of Old Mysore had appointed a Fact-Finding Committee headed by Shri M. Sheshadri,
Retired Minister of the Government of Old Mysore to make an assessment of the level of development in the various Kannada-speaking areas which were to be integrated with the Old Mysore area. The Committee made a detailed study of the development in the fields of education, medical and public health, rural development, industries, irrigation and power etc; and came to the conclusion that the Kannada-speaking areas of Old Bombay, Hyderabad, Madras and Coorg States had not reached the same standard as the Old Mysore and considerable leeway would have to made up to bring them to that level. The following facts about the disparity in economic development and the conditions prevalent in these areas on the eve of Sitchon's Reorganisation were highlighted by the Committee and they are cited here as mentioned in the report:

**Communications**

"The approximate total mileage of roads (exclusive of village roads) in the Kannada areas of Hyderabad, Bombay, South Kanara and Coorg is 7885 miles, 1604.5 miles in Hyderabad, 4593 miles in Bombay, 1275 miles in Madras and 413 miles in Coorg. The average road mileage for every 100 square miles of area works out to 8.6 miles in the Kannada areas of Hyderabad, 21.6 miles in the
Kannada areas of Bombay, 26 miles in South Kanara and 26.3 miles in Coorg. The total road mileage exclusive of village roads in the Mysore State is 10,843 miles. The total length of village roads is 1544 miles. The area of the State excluding Bellary is 29,489 sq. miles. The average road mileage in Mysore State, excluding village roads, works out to 36.7 miles for every 100 square miles. To reach the Mysore standard in respect of road facilities, 50.69 miles of new roads will have to be added to the road mileage in the Kannada areas of Hyderabad and 3245 miles in the Kannada areas in Bombay. The approximate cost of making additional mileage of roads will be Rs. 760 lakhs for Hyderabad, Rs. 486 lakhs for Bombay and Rs. 60 lakhs for Madras. (76)

Education

"The percentage of literacy in the three Districts of Bidar, Raichur and Gulbarga put together is 8.49 as against 20.6 in the Mysore State. In Mysore, the percentage of pupils under instruction in all public institutions, excluding the literacy classes to the total estimated population of school-going age of 24,25,400 is 33.85. On an average, there is one school (excluding literacy classes) for an area of 2.49 square miles and
for every 802 persons. To approximate to the level of Mysore, the number of institutions of all classes including colleges, will have to be doubled. The present expenditure on education is about 75 lakhs of rupees. This expenditure will have to be raised to about 8.150 lakhs. Government Colleges will have to be opened at Bidar and Raichur. This will add 10 lakhs to the expenditure on education.

In the four Districts of Bombay put together, the percentage of pupils actually at school to the estimated population of school-going is 36 as against 33.85 in Mysore. The percentage of literacy in the District of South Kanara in Madras is 23.3 as against 20.6 in the Mysore State.(77)

Medical Relief

"The position in respect of medical relief is exhibited below in the statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>Area in square miles</th>
<th>Population served by each institution (average)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kannada Areas of Hyderabad</td>
<td>431.0</td>
<td>7,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kannada Areas of Bombay</td>
<td>225.0</td>
<td>62,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Kanara</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>47,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coorg</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>14,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mysore</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>19,086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To reach the standard of Mysore, making allowance for variations in the density of population, climatic conditions and other factors, it will be necessary to expand the medical facilities fourfold in the District of Raichur, Bidar and Gulbarga and at least two fold in the Kannada areas of Bombay and South-Kanara. New District Hospitals will have to be built up at Raichur, Bidar and Gulbarga. The equipment leaves much to be desired. Suitable buildings will have to be provided for the existing dispensaries, and the new ones to be opened. In our estimate, this may cost about ₹20 lakhs for building and equipment for District Hospitals and another ₹24 lakhs on buildings for the additional 120 dispensaries in the rural areas.

The maintenance of these hospitals will add about 20 lakhs to the annual expenditure on medical relief in these three Districts. For stepping up public health amenities, we think that the present expenditure may have to be raised by about Five Lakhs of rupees. In the Kannada areas of Bombay, the position is very much better. However, to reach the Mysore standard, the number of institutions will have to be doubled. That is to say, 80 new dispensairos will have to be opened. This
will involve an additional expenditure of 16 lakhs of rupees on building and equipment and an annual additional recurring expenditure of about 12 lakhs for maintenance.\(^{(78)}\)

**Animal Husbandry**

"The position in regard to Veterinary services is exhibited below in the statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kannada areas of the Regions</th>
<th>Number of Veterinary Institutions</th>
<th>Average No. of cattle served by each institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hyderabad</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bombay</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>44,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-Kanara</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,11,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coorg</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mysore</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>28,207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Royal Commission on Agriculture has laid down the standard as one Veterinary institution for every 25000 heads of cattle. In the Kannada Districts of Hyderabad, there are as many as 31 touring billets. These are at best itinerary dispensaries which cannot afford the same facilities as permanent Veterinary institutions. Similarly, in the Kannada Districts of
Bombay, there are 32 dispensaries and 6 Stockmen Centres. Government dispensaries are only 31. To reach the standard prescribed, it will be necessary first to replace the billets, District Board Dispensaries and Stockmen Centres by permanent Veterinary Dispensaries and to double their number. This will involve additional capital expenditure of about rupees ten lakhs on buildings and equipment and a recurring expenditure of about Rs.3½ lakhs on maintenance.\(^{(79)}\)

Revenue and Expenditure

"The Government of Madras gave us to understand that they had not prepared a District-wise break-up of the Revenue and Expenditure figures of the State. No data are therefore available for the South Kanara District. The only information that is available is found in the Report of Honourable Mr. Justice Wanchoo, on the formation of Andhra State. In this report, he has given the figures of Revenue and Expenditure for South-Kanara District for the year 1951-52.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Receipts</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Plus or Minus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South-Kanara</td>
<td>131.14</td>
<td>139.94</td>
<td>-8.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The overall picture in respect of Revenue and Expenditure for 1952-53, the latest year for which District figures are available, is exhibited below in the statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Plus or Minus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hyderabad</td>
<td>3,31,65,856</td>
<td>2,25,47,485</td>
<td>+ 1,06,18,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bombay</td>
<td>5,49,88,000</td>
<td>7,64,51,000</td>
<td>- 2,14,63,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coorg District</td>
<td>90,11,000</td>
<td>89,83,000</td>
<td>+ 28,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exclusive of South Kanara, there will be an annual deficit of 108 lakhs. With the stepping up of expenditure on social services and nation-building activities, particularly in Hyderabad, the overall deficit is bound to be larger in the coming years. The per capita expenditure in 1952-53 works out to Rs.6.00 in the Kannada Districts of Hyderabad, Rs.14.65 in the Kannada Districts of Bombay, Rs.34.16 in Coorg and Rs.19.86 in Mysore.

The capital expenditure during the three years from 1950-51 to 52-53 amounts to Rs.15,43,45,000 in the Kannada
The trios of Hyderabad and Bombay are 83.11,23*72,000 in Hyderabad and 63.4*19,73,000 in Bombay. It is easy to surmise that the Tungabhadra Project accounts for the major portion of this huge expenditure in Hyderabad. Similarly in Bombay, nearly half of this capital expenditure must be on the Ghataprabha Project. Beyond this, we are not in a position to say how much of the expenditure relates to the creation of earning assets and how much to the development of social services.

Taking into account, only the large irrigation and power schemes, the commitment on the basis of present estimates amounts to about Rs.11 crores in respect of Tungabhadra Irrigation Project, about Rs.4 crores in respect of Tungabhadra Hydro-Electric Scheme, rupees one crore in respect of Rajolibanda Diversion Scheme and about Rs.3 crores on the Ghataprabha Project. To this must be added the future expenditure in the Kannada Districts of Bombay on the Jog Electricity Grid. The total commitment exclusive of social services may be roughly placed at Rs.20 crores. This does not take into account the expenditure that is bound to arise for developing the areas served by the Tungabhadra Scheme. The expansion of social services and nation-building activities, such as building of new roads, provision of
schools, hospitals and veterinary dispensaries will involve a further capital expenditure of about fifteen crores of rupees in the coming years.\textsuperscript{(30)}

Thus the Committee made a detailed study of the development in the fields of education, medical and public health, rural development, industries, irrigation and power etc., and came to the conclusion that the Kannada-speaking areas of Old Bombay, Hyderabad, Madras and Coorg States had not reached the same standard as the Old Mysore and considerable leeway would have to be made up to bring them to that level. The Committee indicated that the Kannada areas outside Old Mysore would be deficit areas and the integrated areas would be burdensome on the new administration. The Committee further expressed: "In the event of the Kannada areas being integrated to form a new State, we have no doubt that the Centre will have to give substantial financial assistance to enable the new State to build its future."\textsuperscript{(31)}

\textbf{The Views of States' Reorganisation Commission (1955)}

Similarly the States' Reorganisation Commission expressed certain views in respect of the financial and economic aspects of Karnataka Unification. The views of the Commission are reproduced below:
Paragraph 352: "We have examined in some detail the economic and financial implications of the proposals which we have made, and find that, on the whole, there is much to recommend them. The proposed Karnataka State will have its own major port, for Malpe in South Kanara has already been selected as a possible site on the recommendations of the West Coast Major Ports Development Committee (1950) and preliminary examination of this project has been taken in hand. This incidentally will meet a long-standing complaint of the Bombay and Mysore Karnataka about the absence of adequate shipping facilities."(82)

Paragraph 353: "The prospective financial position of Karnataka as a whole discloses a deficit of the order of one and a half crores of rupees after taking into consideration the immediate possibilities of increasing its revenue and on a realistic assessment of the rate at which public expenditure can be expected to increase. Karnataka, no doubt, will have to bear the fairly heavy burden of servicing the public debt on account of the Tungabhadra and other projects; and as the Upper Krishna, Bhima and Ghatapratha (second stage) projects are taken in hand in the next few years, the burden of the liability on account
of interest charges is bound to increase. This, however, is not Karnataka's peculiar problem; and if it proves that the growth of expenditure permanently outstrips the increase in revenue resources, the problem will have to be viewed not as a by-product of reorganisation but as the result of general economic development."(83)

Paragraph 354: "From a broader point of view, the formation of Karnataka may go some way towards solving the problem of the development of Malnad. Ever since 1901, when the Census first disclosed a decline in population in these areas, this question has come up for consideration from time to time. But the fact that the area is under the jurisdiction of four Governments has, to some extent, impeded the formation and implementation of economic development plans in a co-ordinated manner. The character of the problem has, no doubt, changed to some extent since the last Malnad Development Committee reported in 1950. More schemes and projects are now being considered and it may be no longer true to say that the area is being depopulated. Nevertheless, the fact that practically the whole of Malnad will belong in future to one State is not an insignificant gain and it may be expected that co-ordinated planning for these hilly areas will be easier."(84)
Paragraph 355: "Two important multi-purpose projects, namely, the Tungabhadra and the Upper Krishna irrigation-cum-hydro-electric projects are or are likely to be border projects as the boundaries of the States stand at present. In both these cases, the Unification of Karnataka should facilitate the rapid development of the areas concerned."(85)

Paragraph 356: "Northern Karnataka is now on the eve of large-scale and rapid economic development. The Tungabhadra, Upper Krishna, Bhima, Ghataprabha and Malaprabha projects, when they have been completed, will convert a parched and dry area into one of the best irrigated agricultural regions in the country. The increased production of food and other commodities, after irrigation has been extended, will meet the needs of Mysore, which in years of scarcity suffers from a serious deficiency of food supplies. It is not, therefore, only Northern Karnataka which may hope to benefit from the Unification of the two Kannada speaking areas north and south of the Tungabhadra."(86)

Paragraph 357: "The agricultural, mineral, water and forest resources of Karnataka are considerable. We have no doubt that whichever way one may look at the problem, a United Karnataka will be found to have the essential
unity of a culturally homogeneous and balanced economic region; and to a considerable extent, this unity is even independent of the ties of a common language."(37)

The Views of Legislators

There was an interesting debate on the Report of the States' Reorganisation Commission on 17th, 18th, 19th and 20th November 1955, in the Legislative Council of Old Mysore State. Most of the members of the Council opposed the formation of United Karnataka on the ground of financial and economic considerations. I have cited below the extracts from the speeches made by two members during the proceedings of the Council.

Speech of M.P.L. Shastry

"When you look at the economic aspect of this question, there can be absolutely no doubt whatever that the integration of the other regions with Mysore will result in economic deterioration. The Fact-Finding Committee under the Chairmanship of Shri Sheshadri have already explained this aspect. That position has been accepted by this Commission also. This Commission have conceded that the arguments of the Sheshadri Committee in this regard are acceptable. The income and expenditure position of our
State has deteriorated already. The budget position of our State is not at all sound and the burden of debt has fallen on the people of the State in ever-increasing measure. In these circumstances, if other areas are merged in Mysore, the deficit in our budget will be greatly enhanced. So, we have to consider the relative positions of these units: viz., Mysore and the Unit with Konnada-speaking population outside Mysore and see whether it would be conducive to the interests of the entire country. They have suggested the inclusion of these three Districts belonging to Hyderabad in the proposed Karnataka State. The revenue of that area is £.266 lakhs. So we may infer that only six rupees are being spent on each citizen of that area as against £.23 per head in our area. The Fact-Finding Committee has revealed that by spending at the rate of £.6 per head, that State is having a surplus of £.100 lakhs. We have to compare the figures given out by the Fact-Finding Committee with the figures published by the Government of Hyderabad. The revenue derived from excise works comes to about £.130 lakhs. If prohibition is extended to these areas, then there will be a deficit of £.130 lakhs. So there will be a surplus of £.100 lakhs with a deficit of £.130 lakhs in excise revenue leaving a net deficit of £.30 lakhs.
As regards the areas of Bombay State which have to be included in Mysore State, we find that those areas have a revenue of Rs.549 lakhs and an expenditure of Rs.764 lakhs leaving a deficit of Rs.215 lakhs. If Mangalore is left out, there has been so far a deficit in the budget to the tune of Rs.100 lakhs in those areas. If the scales of pay prevailing in our State are regulated according to this deficit budget, our State will have to incur an additional expenditure of Rs.25 crores. As are spending nearly Rs.3 crores on salaries and it has been pointed out that this expenditure might have to be increased by 25 per cent. It will be seen from these figures that if these two areas which are subjected to such deficits are included in Mysore, the financial position becomes very unsatisfactory and the administration of those areas is sure to collapse. If we look at the facilities that the people of Mysore enjoy viz., in respect of education, medical facilities, health and sanitation, transport conveniences etc., and compare them with the conditions prevailing in other areas at present, we find that merely 30 lakhs of rupees will have to spent each year in order to bring the conditions in other areas on a par with the Mysore State. In order to provide the same transport facilities in Bombay areas as they are
prevailing in this State, it has been pointed out that roads will have to be laid out for 5248 miles there. It has also been pointed out that roads will have to be constructed for 5069 miles in the Hyderabad area. 8317 miles of road will have to be laid out. You are aware of the expenditure that will have to be incurred for laying out each mile of tar-road, cement road, mud-road and metalled road. There is likely to be a deficit of about 5.20.25 crores in this behalf. When there is likely to be such a deficit, I would like to know whether it would be desirable to urge for the inclusion of the units which are subjected to considerable deficits, without keeping in view the economic aspects of the question. If 30 crores of rupees are to be spent every year out of the revenue to provide other facilities in these areas, the problem is how to meet this expenditure? People who have studied the economic aspect of the question say that it is not possible. The people of Mysore enjoy so many amenities and conveniences. When the areas which become part of Mysore are without schools, transport and medical facilities and when such amenities are provided in the Mysore areas, then the members of this House are sure to depreciate it. In order to bring those areas to the level of Mysore, I believe, it would take some ten years. In this period, it will not be possible
to extend roads even by a furlong and to open hospitals and appoint doctors in Mysore." Mr. P. L. S. Shastry continued his speech further and expressed: "I would like to bring to the notice of my friends, that in Hyderabad State for every 1,45,000 people there is one High School, in Bombay State, one High School for every 3,02,000 people and in Mysore State one High School for every 45,000 people. This is so far as the Secondary Education System is concerned. Regarding the Primary School Education, if there is one Primary School for every 1314 people in Bombay State, there is one Primary School for every 802 people in Mysore State. This is the position as regards the educational facilities. To bring them to the level of Mysore, crores of rupees will have to be spent and the people of Mysore are not prepared to shoulder the burden of this expenditure. They have their own heavy responsibilities to share. The Government of Mysore are already spending Rs.23 per capita expenditure and when they have to share so much of expenditure, I am sure, they cannot take up any more additional burden." (88)

Speech of Shri H. P. Govinda Gowda

"We find that the Karnataka areas of Bombay, Hyderabad
and Madras are backward. I would like to point out that those areas did not command the necessary amount of help and facilities from their respective Governments, as were needed for their welfare and progress. We should examine the reasons for this. In those areas, we find that there are places which are at a distance of about 400-500 miles from the capital cities. It was, therefore, not possible for such places to obtain any help from their Governments. Therefore, such places remained backward. Now, let us take up the case of our Malnad. It is about 160-170 miles from the State Capital. Though we have made a number of representations and clamoured that steps be taken to improve Malnad, our cry has become a cry in the wilderness.... Please therefore do not try to impose your decision forcibly on the unwilling throats of the people of Mysore. Let Mysore remain as it is. Let them form Karnataka province with the remaining areas and try to make all kinds of improvements in it."

Birth of United Karnataka

Thus the various Commissions and Committees expressed their views about the pros and cons of the formation of linguistic provinces. Despite the divergent views of the Commissions and Committees, the
people of vitiated Karnataka began to feel intensely about their dismemberment after looking to the language they spoke, their religious and cultural traditions, the saints they revered, the heroes they worshipped, the historical memories they treasured and the similarities they had in social structure. Hence they decided to form United Karnataka. The States' Reorganisation Bill 1956 embodying the decisions of the Government of India was passed by both the Houses of Parliament and the New State of Mysore, now statutorily known as Karnataka, came into existence on 1st November 1956, along with other linguistic provinces of India. After a century and a half of political eclipse, a United Karnataka was formed in 1956. The scattered brethren of Karnataka were united together. It was an epoch-making event in the history of Karnataka. The fond dream of United Karnataka was fulfilled on account of the ceaseless efforts and the incessant struggle put up by many noble souls. The story of Karnataka Unification is nothing but a saga of sacrifices, miseries and sufferings of several great men. The United Karnataka consists of the following territories as per Section 7 of the States' Reorganisation Act, 1956 (vide Map No.3). (90)
A) "The territories of the former State of Mysore;

B) Belgaum District except Chandgad Taluka, Bijapur, Dharwar and North Kanara District in the former State of Bombay;

C) Gulbarga District except Kodangal and Tandur Talukas and Raichur District except Alampur and Gadwal Talukas, Bidar District except Ahmedpur, Nilanga and Udgar Talukas, Zozeorabad Taluka (except Nirna Circle), Nayalkal Circle of Bidar Taluka and Narayankhed Taluka;

D) South Kanara District except Kasargod Taluka and Amindive islands and Kollegal Taluka of Coimbatore District in the former State of Madras; and

E) The territories of the former State of Coorg."

It may be mentioned here that the State of Karnataka has to comprise a few more areas of Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Kerala and Maharashtra where Kannada-speaking people are still living. These people are urging and pleading to the effect that they should be allowed to get themselves integrated with Karnataka, along with their areas. This has been separately dealt with in a Chapter entitled 'Border Disputes'.
Issue of Renaming the State

Though the dream of Unification of Karnataka came into being on 1st November 1956, the name of the State continued to become a matter of bitter controversy. Because the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council of Old Mysore, after discussing the recommendations of the States' Reorganisation Commission as applicable to Karnataka State, passed a resolution in the month of December 1955 in favour of the formation of the New State of Mysore. The resolution said that the name of the New State should be Mysore. After ascertaining the views of the State Legislature of Old Mysore, the Government of India announced their decision on 16th January 1956. They accepted the formation of the New State to be named as Mysore. The people of Old Mysore desired to retain the name as Mysore as a memory of the colourful pageantry and glory of the Old Princely State of Mysore and as a mark of respect they had towards the Maharaja of Mysore, while the people of integrated areas of Bombay, Hyderabad, Madras and Coorg were advocating for 'Karnataka' in the larger context of its connotation. Thus the opinion was sharply divided on renaming the State. But it took 17 years to rename the State as Karnataka. At last, the long cherished aspiration of the
majority of the people of the State to strive for prosperity under the inspiring name of Karnataka reached a decisive stage of fulfilment. Because the present Chief Minister, Shri Devaraj Urs took the initiative and gave content to the long-felt desire of the people. The Official Resolution to change the name of the State from 'Mysore' to 'Karnataka' was moved by the present Chief Minister Shri D. Devaraj Urs in the Mysore Legislative Assembly. It was unanimously adopted by the Assembly on 27-7-1972. Later on, on 5-8-1972, the Mysore Legislative Council also adopted unanimously the same resolution which was moved by Shri K.H. Patil, the then Minister for Agriculture and Forest. The following is the text of the resolution:

"This House declares its firm opinion that the name of this State as mentioned in the Constitution of India should be changed as 'Karnataka' and recommends that steps be taken by the State Government for securing necessary amendments to the Constitution."

Thus the members of both the Houses of the State Legislature gave a big ovation to hail the passage of the historic resolution. Under Section 3 of the Mysore State (Alteration of Name) Act 1973, the State of
Mysore, with effect from the First Day of November 1973, is known as Karnataka. With the renaming of the State as Karnataka, the legendary name of Mysore now passes into the limbo of history. The sentimental and nostalgic attachment to the name of Mysore among a section of the people of Old Mysore finally yielded place in favour of Karnataka. The name Karnataka is said to be derived from the term 'Karnata' which means a lofty region. Literally, Karnataka is a lofty region on account of its hills and plateaux. Figuratively too, Karnataka is a lofty region as its history and heritage testify. (Vide Historical and Geographical Factors of Unification.) Since times immemorial, Karnataka has been the scene of great empires and glorious achievements. Thus, the penance of those who struggled for Unification of Karnataka has, at last, borne fruit.
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