

Then again, in the Adilabad district, there are two taluks, Kinwat and Rajora which have got an undisputed majority area of Marathi-speaking people. These two taluks should be joined to Maharashtra. There is also another taluk which has got a majority of Gonds who have been influenced by Marathi. They have infiltrated from Chanda, and as you know, they have got their panchayat in Chanda and they have got Marathi names, Marathi culture and Marathi schools and soon. So they form the majority in the Uttanur taluk. This and the Itchod circle of Baath taluk, both these should be joined to Maharashtra.

I thank the Congress High Command for having listened to the grievances of the Maharashtrian people and for having brought them under one State excluding the city of Bombay. I appeal to the Congress leaders to listen to the fears and apprehensions which have been expressed concerning the prospect of not joining Bombay city with Maharashtra. With their help and with their advice, I am sure the fears and apprehensions of the people who are against joining Bombay city with Maharashtra could be allayed.

Lastly, let me say that we submit that it is not in the national interests that 30 millions of people should be kept disappointed and dissatisfied. So, I appeal to our leaders that every effort be made to join the city of Bombay to the whole population of Maharashtra.

**The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):** Sir, this is the seventh day, I believe, of this debate and, as you have just informed us, 70 persons have previously spoken. So, I am the 71st in this long succession. I have been hesitating as to whether I should take up the time of this House in this Marathon race not because I am not only not interested in this question but I was doubtful if I could throw much light on it. I might straight off say that I am not greatly interested as to

where a particular State boundary is, and I find it very difficult to get passionate or excited about it. Naturally, I have my preferences, but it does not make much difference to me whether any internal boundary of a State is drawn here or there. What is infinitely more important is what happens on either side of the boundary, what happens within the State and more especially in those great areas, which inevitably are few. Look at that from the linguistic point of view, multi-lingual or bilingual—as there are bound to be a large number of areas—what happens to people inside a particular State who may either linguistically or in any other sense form what might be called a minority. That seems to me a far more important proposition than where you draw the line. Because, if you once lay down those basic principles correctly, and act up to them, then the vast number of problems that arise and difficulties and legitimate grievances would inevitably disappear.

Now, for a moment, I may as well say to the House that I am not speaking particularly in my capacity as Prime Minister or on behalf of Government and I am not going to make any epoch-making pronouncement. We, in Government, have been considering this Report and the other matters that flow from it for the last many weeks and we shall continue to consider them till we come up to this House in some form of placing the recommendations for this House to consider. And, it will not be proper for me or for any other member of Government to express himself in any tone of finality about any matter. But, I may give expression to my own inclinations in regard to the recommendations of the Report or the other suggestions that have been made.

One thing I should like to say is that I have regretted very greatly certain criticisms that have been made in the Press, in some newspapers—I do not know how far any hon. Member indulged in such criticisms—criticisms of the Commission. One can criticise their recommendations; of course, that

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

is a different matter; but criticisms of the Commission and sometimes very strong criticisms about their unfairness and all that, I think, that is a very unfair approach and it is a kind of approach which is bound to make such work now or hereafter much more difficult. We choose eminent men; they take a great deal of trouble and tell us what they think about the problem. You may or may not agree with it but to attack, in a sense, their *bona fides* or fairness, if I may say so, apart from its wrong approach, does indicate, to my mind, that your case is very weak. It is the old story of abusing the attorney on the other side.

May I also suggest for the consideration of this House that while Members here represent their constituencies, of course, they do something more. They are not only Members of this or that particular area of India, but each Member of Parliament is a Member of India and represents India, and at no time can we afford to forget this basic fact that India is more than the little corner of India that we represent. We know, all of us, that we have to face certain forces which may be called separatist, that is to say—I am not using the word in any bad sense—it nevertheless means that people's attention is being diverted more to local problems, parochial, State, Provincial and forgetting the larger problems of India. There should be really no conflict between the two but it is a question of the method in our thinking, in our minds, in considering our problems. There is the word in the English language 'parochial'. That is, a person thinks of his parish or village while he forgets the larger considerations; while he thinks too much of even of a State as big or important he forgets these larger considerations.

Now, it has been my good fortune and privilege to travel about India a great deal and often to go abroad. Perhaps, I have had that good fortune more than most Members of this House. The result is that I am con-

stantly compelled to think in larger terms, not only in national terms but even in international terms and see this picture of India in that context. Perhaps, that is helpful in giving a truer perspective of events. I travel about India and I see this moving drama of India and I feel excited and inspired by it. I see many things that I do not, of course like; but the major thing is this tremendous drama that is India today moving as if by the dictates of some predestined fate and destiny towards its goal. It is a tremendous thing and we see that not only in India. I would submit to this House we see it even more if we go abroad and see this country of India in the south of Asia, from some distance, see it in proper perspective. I would beg the House to consider that there are many people in the wide world who also are beginning to feel the sense of drama and adventure about what is happening in India. Now that is the perspective. And they say also how we have got over great problems and great difficulties. It is true that we have even greater problems ahead, but in the measure in which we have succeeded in the past, that is the measure with which they judge of our strength to succeed in the future. That perspective, I submit, has some importance. We may argue as to the boundary of Bihar or Bengal or Orissa or some State or other—and I have no doubt that the argument on the question is an important one and I do not say it should be brushed aside—but the word 'important' also is a relative word. There may be other things which may be more important, and one must not lose oneself in passionate excitement as to where the boundary of a State should be, provided, as I said, we have this fuller conception of India and provided we have, by Constitution, convention or otherwise, the fullest guarantees that whether a person lives on this side of the border of a State or the other, he will have the fullest rights and opportunities of progress according to his own way. In this sense I tried to approach this

matter, and I felt that perhaps this larger outlook was sometimes lost sight of. We talked about linguistic provinces and some people said that this principle of linguism should be extended more and more; some people criticised my colleague, the Home Minister, because he did not quite make that the final test. May I say quite briefly and precisely that I dislike that principle absolutely 100 per cent. as it has tended to go?

Now I want to make it perfectly clear that that does not mean that I dislike language being a very important matter in our administration or education or culture, because I do think that the language of the people is a vital matter for their development, whether it is education, administration or any other matter. But I do distinguish between the two things, this passion for putting yourself in a linguistic area and putting up a wall all round and calling it the border of your State and developing the language to the fullest extent, because I do not think that the people can really grow except through the language; I accept that completely, but it does not follow in my mind that in order to make them grow and their language, you must put a barrier between them and others, that you must put a wall all round and call that this is this language area or that. For a State, broadly speaking, there are language areas in India; of course, you cannot ignore them and there is no need to; they are welcome as they are; they represent the development of history through the ages. But considering them as something opposed to the others and putting a hard and fast line between the two areas is, I think, carrying it too far. As a matter of fact, it just does not matter where you draw your line. If you judge it from the purely linguistic point of view, you go against the wishes of some—may be many. There are invariably bilingual areas, and if they are not today bilingual areas, are you going to prevent people from going from one State to another? Are you going to stop, contrary to the dic-

tates of our Constitution, the movement of population, the movement of workers or of other people from one State to another? You cannot. Therefore, whatever fixed line you may even draw, if that movement is free, people will go, will be attracted by one side or other, and again change the linguistic composition of that State or the border area. Are we going to sit down every few years or ten years and say, "Now the ratio of this particular tehsil or taluk has changed and, therefore, it should be taken out of this State and put into another". It is quite impossible if you think in that way. Therefore, you must realise that while there are clearly marked linguistic areas of great languages, there are also almost always between two areas bilingual areas, from the language point of view and sometimes even trilingual areas. And wherever you may draw your line, you do justice to one group and injustice to another. What is our difficulty in these problems is raised in this Report and there are many difficulties. By looking at it purely from the language point of view, the difficulty is that there is good reason, good logic and good argument for every case, on both sides of the case. That is the difficulty. If there is logic only on one side, we decide it easily; but there is logic on both sides and the two logics conflict. There is argument on both sides. You may balance the two and say that this argument is stronger than that; by and large, the case of one side is somewhat better, but the fact is that the case of the other side is pretty good too. Are you to measure merely in a balance—maps and census figures have become the fashion now—how many individuals are supposed to speak in this or that language? Because there is a slight majority in this case, this kind of a thing may be all right. It might be done sometimes, but it leads us ultimately to all kinds of fantastic conclusions. Therefore, I submit that we must consider this matter separating the question of language in the sense that we must be clear that the language has to be developed, more especially all the great languages of

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

India which are mentioned in the Constitution—but I would go a step further—and even those that are not mentioned in the Constitution like those in the North East Frontier Area and elsewhere ought to be developed; secondly, that the development of one language should not be and cannot be at the expense of the other. It is a strange notion that the development of one language comes in the way of another language in India. I am absolutely convinced that the development of any one of the great languages of India helps the development of the other languages of India. It is my privilege, however unworthy I might be, of being the President of the Sahitya Akadami, started a year or two ago where we deal with all the languages of India and try to encourage them; the more we discuss these matters, the more we see that every encouragement, development and growth of the language results in the other Indian languages also getting some advantage of growing. And we of course are trying to have translations of one from the other and so on. I would go a step further and say that the knowledge of a foreign language helps the growth of an Indian language. If we are cut off from foreign languages, we are cut off from the ideas that come in those foreign languages—with not only the ideas but the technology which is part of modern life. Therefore, let us not think of excluding a language. I do not for instance understand—I may be quite frank—the way some people are afraid of Urdu language. I am proud to speak Urdu and I hope to continue to speak Urdu. I just do not understand why in any State in India people should consider Urdu as a foreign language or something which invades into their own domain. I just do not understand it. Urdu is a language mentioned in our Constitution. Is it intended to live in the upper atmosphere or stratosphere without coming down to the earth? I just do not understand it. It is this narrow-mindedness that I object to.

Shri Chattopadhyaya: Tell your colleagues, please.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I consider the hon. Member opposite also my colleague.

It is no good. People go into arguments in regard to philology, in regard to other things. Take the Punjabi language. We heard learned arguments about the origin of Punjabi and Gurmukhi script and how far it is connected with Hindi and how far it is independent of Hindi; whether it has descended from Sanskrit etc., as if it was of the slightest significance, to what source it belongs. What matters is what people do today. Let scholars go into the past of Gurmukhi, Hindi or anything. What is done today? If people in Punjab or elsewhere are accustomed, or if they wish to have, to use or to speak a certain language and to use a certain script, I want to give them every freedom, every opportunity and every encouragement to do that. Because, as a matter of fact, speaking from the strictly narrowest, practical and opportunist point of view, the more you try to suppress it the more opposition there is, and the more, if I may say, it survives the suppression. Everybody knows that in regard to language there are intimate, rather passionate ideas connected with it in people's minds—something very intimate. I can understand the passion with regard to any language—Hindi or any other. But the person who feels passionately about a language must also remember that the other fellow also feels passionately about it. That is the difficulty. Therefore, the safest and the only course is to give every freedom and opportunity to all of them. Let them develop in the natural course of events. They will adapt themselves; they will affect each other and influence each other and grow more and more important, if they have the capacity or remain less developed. It is not for any person or for me to go about and say that



any language—let us say, the Gurmukhi language—is an undeveloped language. It may be. It does not matter. We should try to develop it then and allow the natural forces to increase the importance and the use of these languages. Any attempt to decry or deny a language is bad not only from that language's point of view but from the point of view of other languages and those who use the other languages. It is the only correct policy both from the point of view of good policy and even if you look from the narrower points of view.

I am dealing with this question of language because it has somehow come to be associated with this question of States reorganisation. I repeat, if I may, that I attach the greatest importance to the language but I refuse to associate it necessarily with a State. Inevitably of course, in India as it is, there are bound to be States where one language is predominant. If that is so, let it be so; we encourage that. But there are also bound to be areas where there are two languages; as I have said, we should encourage both of them. We should make it perfectly clear that the dominant language of that State should not try to push out or suppress or ignore in any way the other language of the State. If we are clear about that, then the language issue does not arise.

Other issues may arise—economic and others. With language of course other aspects, cultural aspects which are connected with them may arise. Then the two should be treated on the same basis. That is to say, every culture, every manifestation of culture should be encouraged. Culture is not an exclusive thing. The more inclusive you are, the more cultured you are. The more barriers you put up, the more uncultured you are. That is the definition of culture. Therefore, culturally too, we should encourage every aspect of culture. If, as the world develops and changes, something falls out, let it fall out. But

if you try to push it down or push it back, then you are probably not likely to succeed and in fact it brings in conflict which injures your own culture possibly.

Thinking as I do in this matter, I personally welcome the idea of bilingual or multi-lingual areas. For my part, I would infinitely prefer living and my children being brought up in bilingual and tri-lingual areas than in a unilingual area. Because of that, I think I would gain wider understanding of India and of the world and a wider culture—not a narrow culture, however big that narrow culture may be.

The House will forgive me, if I mention a rather personal thing. This is in relation to my daughter. When I had to face the problem of her education—unfortunately, I was a bad father and I was not with her for years and years—my attempt was this; when she was a little girl I sent her to a school—not in U.P. as I wanted her, as a child, to pick up some of India's languages—in Poona; I sent her to a Gujarati school in Poona because I wanted her to know the Marathi language and the Gujarati language and their influence. I sent her subsequently to Shantiniketan because I wanted her to understand the Bengali background—not only the language but the cultural background. Whether I succeeded or she succeeded or not—that is another matter. My point is that my outlook was such. I should like her to go down south and learn Tamil or Telugu or Malayalam. But of course life is not long enough to go to every State.

Shri Meghnad Saha (Calcutta-North-West): May I interrupt? What is the percentage of people who have the capacity to learn more than one language? Ninety per cent. of the people have no capacity for learning a second language and you must legislate for those ninety per cent. of people.

**Mr. Speaker:** Let there be no argument in between.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** The hon. Member has put a question: what is the percentage of people who can learn other languages? Well, if I may say so, I imagine that the percentage is very very large. I will tell you what I mean by it. You and I may have some difficulty in picking up another language because we proceed by grammar and all that. But you take persons—pick them out from the Delhi bazaar and put them in an environment of another language. You will find in three months they will talk that language which you will not know. I know and I can tell you another instance. In our foreign missions, our Secretaries and others are supposed to learn the language of that country. They do try to learn in a scientific way. Before they know anything of that language, some of the lower staff who have to work there pick up the language and talk in it. So, it is not merely a question of learning a language correctly but being in a position to understand it and thereby entering into the life of other people; that is important. There is nothing so difficult as trying to understand another people unless you can speak to them directly without an interpreter. Interpreter is a great nuisance.

Therefore, I would say that the first question for us and the most important question in this entire Report is the last portion—the last chapters in which they mention certain safeguards. Whether they are enough or not is another matter. Add to them if you want. But the point is that there should be clear safeguards laid down, possibly in the Constitution, otherwise, by some other way, so that a fair deal could be given to every language everywhere in this country. There should be no argument about that. We should not say: we are in a majority and therefore our language should prevail. Every language has equal right to prevail even if it is a minority language in the country; of

course there have to be some good numbers. You cannot have it for every small group. I understand that the Bombay Corporation has schools in fourteen languages; because Bombay is a great city with all kinds of language groups there.

Secondly, if I may venture to lay down a rule, in very matter it is the primary responsibility of the majority to satisfy the minority. The majority by virtue of its being a majority naturally has strength to have its way; it requires no protection. It is a bad custom, a most undesirable custom to give statutory protection to minorities; it is not good. Sometimes it is right that you should do that to give an encouragement, let us say to backward classes, but it is not a good thing. Therefore, by its being in the stronger position it is the duty and responsibility of the majority community, whether it is linguistic, whether it is religious, whether it is caste—whatever it may be—to pay particular attention to what the minority there wants, to win it over. It is strong enough to crush it if other forces do not protect it. Therefore, I am always personally in favour, wherever such a question arises, of the minority there, whether it is a linguistic minority or a religious minority.

Talking about religion in the broad sense of the word, obviously in India the votaries of the Hindu religion outnumber others tremendously. Nobody is going to push them from their position; they are strong enough. Therefore, it is their responsibility, and special responsibility that people following other religions in India, which may be called minority religions, have the fullest freedom, have the fullest liberty and a feeling of satisfaction that they have their full play. If that particular principle is applied then I think most of these troubles and grievances would disappear.

About a month ago I think, or less, at that tremendous legion—meeting in Calcutta which was a kind of public

reception to the Soviet leaders who were here—much has been said about Panch Shila; as the House knows everybody talks about Panch Shila—I ventured to say that this Panch Shila was no new idea to the Indian mind—maybe, to other minds also it is not new—and that, in fact, it was inherent in Indian thinking, in Indian culture, because Panch Shila ultimately is the message of tolerance. And, I quoted at that mighty meeting—I do not know whether it was very proper on that occasion or not—Ashoka's edicts and said: "This is the basis of Indian culture and Panch Shila flows from it". Naturally it is not an imposed thing on us. We may misbehave as we sometimes do—that is a different matter—; but the basic Indian thought is that, and it has continued for these long ages.

Now, we thought of this Panch Shila and peaceful co-existence in the wide world, warring world, and we have gained a measure, a considerable measure of respect and attention because of that. Why have we done so? Well, partly, I would submit, because our thinking has been correct and based on some principles which are not so opportunist, and partly also because our thinking has been correctly laid down have not been very divergent from the action we have taken; that is, there has been an approximation in the ideals we have laid in regard to foreign policy and the action we have taken. I do not say they absolutely coincide, but there has been an approximation, and whenever thought and action fit in strength follows. It is the conflict between one's so-called ideals and one's action that leads to bad results and to frustration in the individual, or the group, or the nation. Where a nation is fortunate, or a group, or an individual, to be able to act according to his own ideals, well, then it achieves results. It is in our struggle for independence and freedom that we were fortunate in being able, largely, to combine our ideals with our day-to-day activities as well as give

strength to us as individuals and as a nation.

Therefore, we have succeeded in this measure in our foreign policy, and may I as an interlude just mention two matters not only because they are relevant, but because we have been criticised with regard to them in foreign countries? The two questions are Goa and Kashmir. We are criticised by some people that, we who talk loudly about peace and loudly about anti-colonialism and all that—well, it is said by our critics—follow a different policy in Kashmir and Goa. Now, I think that possibly when history comes to be written Kashmir and Goa will be the brightest examples of our tolerance, of our patience and the way we have suppressed our anger and resentment at many things in order to follow that broad idealistic policy that we have laid down.

Now, I was saying that what I am concerned with is not so much the boundaries here and there, I am concerned with two things: first the principles; that is the principle of life wherever you may live, on whichever side, and, secondly, the manner of approach to this problem; that is to say: how do we discuss these matters, how do we decide them, how do we accept the decisions made. That is vital. That is more important than what you decide. A person is judged more by that. Anybody can decide things according to his own wishes, but when a group meets, of varying opinions, how do they decide? There is the method of democracy, of discussion, of argument, of persuasion and ultimate decision and acceptance of that decision even though it goes against our gain and our opinion. That is the democratic method; or else, simply the bigger lathi or the bigger bomb prevails and that is not the democratic method. Whether you consider this matter in problems of atomic bombs are street demonstration the question is the same. That is to say, I am not objecting to demonstrations, but I am objecting to the violent

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

part of it, the violence of it. There are democratic ways of demonstration too. I am objecting to the violence coming in in these matters and that violence is, in quality, the same perhaps. Then there is violence of atomic bombs. At any rate the violence of the atomic bomb has a tremendous course, tremendous destruction, but it does not poison your personal thinking so much which smaller violences do. When you begin to hate your neighbour you cannot pull on with your neighbour. That is a more dangerous thing from the point of view of degradation of the individual. That hatred seeps in, the hatred of your neighbour and it is bad enough. Of course, to hate a country or a whole nation is bad but somehow that spreads out. That hatred is not good, but the hatred of an individual, group or a community, the hatred of a Hindu for a Muslim or the hatred of a Muslim for a Hindu or a Sikh, that type of thing is much worse. It poisons your daily life. So, I submit what is more important is the method of decision. Do we believe in peaceful democratic methods or means or not? That is the test question in this matter, because we feel passionately. Let us admit that many of us feel very strongly about our point of view on this matter and no doubt they have reasons for feeling strongly. I do not object to that but we must be strong enough, in spite of our feeling strongly to realise that it is far more important that this question should be discussed calmly, deliberately and peacefully, and whatever decisions are arrived at by the final authority—and the final authority of course is this Parliament—must be accepted, because there is no absolute finality about any decision. But also, at the same time, nobody wants the whole question to be brought up and discussed again and again frequently. If one can do it calmly or objectively, one can do it, so, we need not think that we are tied down to a particular decision for ever. At the same time, we should accept it and work it with all goodwill. Therefore, the basic question is one of ap-

proach, of goodwill. It really does not matter what the decision is.

Now, the two or three most important questions appear to be, let us say, the questions in regard to the State of Bombay or Punjab or any other. Now, what do we aim at? What can we aim at? Obviously to me, speaking for myself, I do not care two pins as to what happens to them provided that the people of Punjab or the people of Bombay have goodwill for each other. That is the basic thing. It does not matter how you divide or sub-divide one State or two States or three or four States. That is a matter which we could consider on administrative, economic, and linguistic and other grounds. But the basic thing is that after having done that, do you create goodwill and co-operation amongst the people who live there, because, if you do not, it does not matter how much you justify the decisions made by census figures and arguments and maps. If you do not create that goodwill, you fail completely, because we have to live and work together.

We have in India, as I ventured to say a little earlier, a moving sight. What is happening in India? We—this Parliament and the people of India—are working hard to weave this pattern of India's destiny, with its variegated, many-coloured facets and many languages and yet, it is under one Government that we are weaving gradually at present. Now, if, instead of weaving it, we take the scissors and the knife and start tearing it and make holes in it, that is bad. What is the pattern you give? Therefore, the basic thing is the goodwill that accompanies a decision and we should remember it.

Some hon. Members here may well remember that I delivered quite a number of speeches in Hyderabad opposing tooth and nail, if I may use the word, the disintegration of the State of Hyderabad. That was my view. I would still like the State of



Hyderabad not to be disintegrated, but circumstances have been too strong for me. I accept them. I cannot force the people of Hyderabad or the other people to come in a particular line because I think they should do so. I accept the decision and I adjust myself to the change that Hyderabad be disintegrated. If it is going to be disintegrated, the Commission has suggested that the Telangana area, the remaining part of Hyderabad State, should remain for five years and then it may be decided. We have no particular objection, but logically speaking, considering everything, it seems to me unwise to allow this matter to be left to argument. Let it be taken up now and let us be done with it.

When I read this Report first rather hurriedly, I may assure this House—because some people seem to doubt it—that I had seen not a single line of the Report before it was officially handed to me, and I knew very, very little about what it contained before I got it. So, I read it as something almost new. Because of that, many parts of it and many proposals that it contained were new to me. I had absolutely no notion what they are going to suggest about Bombay, Punjab, Madhya Pradesh and about any other place. I had no notion at all. The thing which for the moment rather surprised me somewhat was the proposal about Madhya Pradesh for the simple reason that it was quite novel to me. I have not thought of it in those terms at all. I said so in the broadcast—not criticised—but I said that some parts of the Report came as a surprise to me. They did; but I thought about it; we discussed it amongst ourselves. The more we discussed, the more we talked, I became more and more convinced that it was the right proposal. I had no preconceptions and prejudices about this or that. So, the House will notice how my mental approach to all these problems was—to keep an open mind and try to understand the various aspects of it and in particular to arrive at a decision which is an agreeable one and

which creates goodwill as far as possible. Because of this, apart from official approaches to this problem, we have met literally hundreds and hundreds of persons in group of five, ten or twenty, who were coming from almost every State of India and putting forward their viewpoints. We have listened to them and we have discussed it with them, because we want the greatest measure of agreement and cordiality about this and because we attach more importance to a decision having that goodwill, even though it might be logically not a good decision: for, logic is a very feeble and unworthy substitute of goodwill. I would rather have goodwill than logic, and co-operation. We have proceeded that way. How far it will succeed wholly in creating that goodwill I do not know. But I am quite positive that, however much the Government may or may not succeed, this House can succeed if it wants to create that and give that lead to the country in deciding these things rightly or wrongly but with goodwill, and accepting the decisions made. Then, if something is wrong about the decisions, we can consider them quietly later on.

Now, take two of the major problems—the question of Bombay and Punjab.

**An Hon. Member:** Bihar also.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** With the greatest respect for our friends in Bihar and Bengal and Orissa, I would say that nothing is more unimportant than their problem. I am really astonished at the amount of heat, about these three or four States, which has been imported. We can consider it and decide it. But what does it matter if a patch of Bihar goes this way and a patch of Bengal or Orissa goes the other way? I cannot get excited about it provided always that they get fair treatment. That is the vital and important point.

About Bombay, which undoubtedly is one of our major difficulties, I think there are arguments advanced on the part of Maharashtrians, on the part of

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

others in Bombay, and I have no doubt at all that the arguments advanced about the Maharashtrians have great force. But, unfortunately, I see the force in the other arguments too. Obviously, nobody can say that it is a one-sided affair. Then, how does one deal with it? Hon. Members know that the Congress Working Committee, after considerable discussion, suggested three States, but speaking for myself I hate them and believe that the recommendation made by the States Reorganisation Commission was the best in the circumstances. But, I do not wish to compel others to accept it, because the Maharashtrians, Gujaratis and others are the people who have to reside there. Who am I to push my opinion down their throats, more especially the Maharashtrians who played such a vital part in India's history and who have to play such a vital part in the future of India? But I do think that was a fair and equitable decision which would have promoted co-operative working and which could, if necessary later, have been added to or amended. There is nothing to prevent it; I still think that it will be the best thing. I do not know if the time is past for considering that matter afresh by the people most affected by it.

1 P.M.

Take Punjab. People talk about uni-lingual and bi-lingual States. I have already laid stress on the importance I attach to language; and, in relation to Punjab, I would lay stress on the importance I attach to the Punjabi language. I attach importance to it, because, apart from the very important fact of a large number of the Sikhs or all the Sikhs wanting it—that is the major factor good enough for me; it does not come against me—I do not know why the Hindi-knowing people should object. I say that a language should not be considered something exclusive or excluding others; we must be inclusive in our thinking. But, apart from that, the minor modulations of a language represent the growth of a particular specific culture in a group. The

folk-songs of Punjab are an immensely important part of the Punjabi culture. It does not matter to me for the moment how many books on technology exist in the Punjabi language in the Gurmukhi script. If they do not exist, it is a great drawback from the national point of view. Either that drawback will be made good, or it will suffer and it will not advance with us in the future. But I do wish to give every encouragement to the Punjabi language, not at the expense of Hindi. There is no question of expense of Hindi; Hindi is strong enough, wide enough and powerful enough in every way to go ahead. They should co-operate with each other. This whole outlook of one language trying to push out the other is a wrong outlook. So, I have laid stress on this linguistic point. If you look at the Punjab from the linguistic point of view, from the point of view of numerous proposals made, you will find that there is no proposal conceivable which makes the Punjab completely uni-lingual, that is to say, uni-lingual in the sense the entire thing being based on Punjabi in Gurmukhi script. So far as the speaking part is concerned, it might well be said that nearly all Punjabis speak Punjabi, whatever they may say. In fact, even Hindi or Urdu is half Punjabi, so that, if you look at it from the communal point of view, it is a bad attempt. It does not matter how much you may divide Punjab, but the Hindus and Sikhs are intermixed completely. You may, by adjustments make one 45 per cent. and the other 55 per cent. the one 30 per cent. and the other 70 per cent. and so on. But, you do not change the basic fact that both are completely mixed up in each village. And, therefore, the only way for Punjab to exist and prosper, rather, even to exist, is for both to pull together. There is no other way. Of course, the Punjabis are people with very great virtues; but among their great virtues, the virtue of pulling together has not been known. Perhaps it may be due to their greater vitality. They

are very vital people. Even today Punjab is probably the most prosperous of our States from the common people's point of view. Nowhere in India do people drink more milk and *lassi* than in the Punjab. They have a future before them of great advance; with Bhakra Nangal and other schemes, that is a tremendous future and it surprises me that they should waste their great energies when they have all this work before them. Again I would say, if, as they are, the Hindus in the Punjab are in a majority—I am not for a moment talking about the shape of things to come regarding boundaries; I am not going into it—it is their duty to win over the Sikhs; and, it is the duty of the Sikhs to win over the Hindus. This business of going against each other, trying to trip each other and weaken each other is not, if I may say so, mature politics. It is immaturity and we have grown out of it in India.

There are one or two things I should like to say before I finish. We have to examine all these matters, all these changes, from the point of view of our economic development, Second Five Year Plan, etc. It is highly important. It is true that in drawing up the Second Five Year Plan, there has been an attempt made to draw it up for almost each individual district, so that if the district changes over to another area, it does not affect it so much. But, if you uproot the whole State, practically all your energy and resources will be spent in the next two or three years in settling down and not in the Five Year Plan. One should like to avoid it.

Finally, the more I have thought about it, the more I have been attracted to something which I used to reject seriously and which I suppose is not at all practicable now. That is the division of India into four, five or six major groups regardless of language, but always, I will repeat, giving the greatest importance to the language in those areas. I do not want this to be a thing to suppress language, but rather to give it an encouragement.

That, I fear, is a bit difficult. We have gone too far in the contrary direction. But, I would suggest for this House's consideration a rather feeble imitation of that. That is, whatever final decisions Parliament arrives at in regard to these States, we may still have what I would call zonal councils, i.e., a group of 3, 4 or 5 States, as the case may be, having a common council. To begin with, I would say that it should be an advisory council. Let us see how it develops. Let it be advisory; let the Centre also be associated with it for dealing with economic problems as well as the multitude of border problems and other problems that arise. There can be, let us say, 5 such zonal areas.

**Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad):** A common High Court.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** There may be, as the hon. Member suggests, in some places a common High Court, a common Governor, etc.; but, common economy is more important. We are having these big schemes, river valley and other. It will be very helpful. In the main, I want them to develop the habit of co-operative working to break down the wall. It may be that, later, the Advisory Zonal Councils may develop into something more important. I think we should proceed slowly and cautiously so that people may not suspect an undermining of their State's structure. So, we could have, let us say, five: one for the north, one for the south, one for the east, one for the west and one for the Centre.

**Shri Kamath:** Dakshin, Purva, etc.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Something like that. I would submit that for the consideration of this House.

**Shri Chattopadhyaya:** On a point of Information, while I listened, as the House did, with very deep respect and interest to the speech of our beloved Prime Minister, my colleague on that other side, I should like with equally, deep humility to ask whether it is in