

CHAPTER - IV.

DAILY PUDHARI AND REGIONAL POLITICAL MOVEMENTS.

THE PUDHARI AND REGIONAL MOVEMENT.

- CHAPTER No. 4. -

Free-press is a great power. It plays a very significant role in promoting public opinion. Sometimes by pointing out the mistakes of the government, ^{and} most of the good plans of the government, are revealed through this agency because of which the very spirit of democracy is preserved. In the previous chapter The Contribution of News agency ~~is~~ ~~Agency~~ in promoting the struggle for independence has been dealt with. The movement ~~is~~ for united Maharashtra, Maharashtra Karnataka Boundry issue, and the role played by Pudhari towards the handling these problems are to be dealt with in this chapter. The special emphasis is to be laid on the contribution made by 'Pudhari' in the formation of regional movements.

Both central and state governments are highly impressed by the writings published in 'Hindustan Times', 'Indian Express', 'Times of India', etc. Apart from these newspapers like 'Kesari', 'Maratha', 'Loksatta', 'Pudhari', 'Tarun-Bharat', etc. also seem to have been cast a tremendous influence over the government in the cause of this movement. The daily Pudhari of Kolhapur is remarkable of all the newspapers. It has supported the causes of the United Maharashtra Movement right from the beginning through its title articles. The period in between January 1st, 1939 to August 15, 1947 is

very important in this connection. Even after India's independence and after lingual provincial pattern upto the emergence of United Maharashtra i.e. 1st May, 1960, Pudhari has gave its unfailing support to the Movement. Even today also its is because of Pudhari that the boundary issue is ^{kept alive} one of the burning topics of the day. The writings in 'Pudhari' in between 1960 to 1985 shows that it has presented the problems before the government and ^{exhibited} stated the grievances of the people very skilfully.

Political Back-ground of India :-

British people introduced provincial system in India. They divided India into various provinces, of course they did not intend for lingual recognition of the provinces on the contrary they followed the principle of divide and rule. As a first step in this policy they tried to divide Bengal in 1905. But because of the intervention of National Congress the attempt went as a failure ~~in 1911~~. Through this intervention it can be said that the congress gave its consent for the principle of lingual division indirectly. Around the same period other states like Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Orissa, Assam etc. were created on the same principle. The provincial division on the basis of language was already sanctioned in the constitution of Congress which was adopted in 1920. The same principle was also assumed to be taken for granted in the Indian Constitutional Committee which consisted Jawaharlal Nehru and Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru.

① V. R. Dhandar in Maharashtra - Karnataka Border disputeⁿ p. 1
Kirti Prakashan, Bombay 22.

But this principle was not implemented in South India. The states in South India were created on multi lingual basis. In pre-independence period Congress had approved the principle of langual provincial organisation of the states through various Congress conference. ²Even Mahatma Gandhi had also agreed this principle. It was agreed by the National Congress unanimously that because of this principle it is very easy to look after the political affairs. It is through the language of the people that the good relations between the government and the people can be established. This stand was taken in the Congress conferences held at Nagpur, Belgaun, Calcutta. In the election manifesto of Congress this principle was considered. After freedom ~~some so-called~~ leaders of Congress advocated that the provinces must be reconstructed on the principle of language and ³in 1953, on these grounds the Andhra state was separated from Madras state under the tremendous pressure of public opinion. After this the people started to push forward their demands to the central government. ^{for separate state based on language} The Government appointed a number of commissions to think ~~of~~ over the issue through which the problem of the issue of United Maharashtra got a major momentum. But unfortunately no proper solution was sought ~~except that. The~~ ~~organisation of the states.~~

The Problem of United Maharashtra :-

In the pre-independence period the division of states on the basis of language as a principle was present

- ② Ibid Page - 2
 ③ Ibid " - 5

but it had not assumed the form of a movement. The Major aim to get achieve freedom. Naturally this problem was neglected. But after independence because of the growing political consciousness and the pride for mother tongue among the people the problem got prominence.

The central part of Maharashtra was dominated by Nizam State, the Bombay State and Goa was under Portugise's regime. Apart from these fractions, there existed different controversies among the Marathi people which created an air of mistrust and misunderstanding among the masses; but still the urge for United Maharashtra was unhampered. As a result on 1st August, 1958, the regional legislature of Varhad Central State passed a resolution according to which the bilingual formula adopted in central state was cancelled and a coherent Marathi state Vidharbha was created. Thus it was the very first instance where a resolution was passed by the representatives of the people in the legislature.

In 1946, the problem of United Maharashtra was discussed in the 'Sashittya Sammelan' presided over by Shri. G. T. Madkholkar. It was decided in the 'Sammelan' that a separate United Maharashtra should be created for the Marathi speaking people. For the implementation of this resolution a separate committee was formed under Shankarrao Des. The committee was known later to be All Party United Maharashtra

(5) Shrimao Kulkarni " Maharashtra Mahatma " 12/11/57. 152.

Council. The demand for lingual state organisation was pressed forward by Congress Leaders as well as by Maha-Vidharbha Sabha in 1940. Later the issue gained prominence through the 'Sahitye Sammelan' held at Belgaum.

United Maharashtra Council :-

5
United Maharashtra Council was established under the presidentship of Shankarrao Doo on 22nd July, 1946. The active participants in this council were Keshavrao Jedhe, Daokinandan Narayan, Dr. Dhananjayrao Gadgil, Shri. Anant Dange, Dr. Narawan, Principle D.R. Chherapur, Appaso Deogirikar, Yashwantrao Chavan, N. G. Gore, S. M. Joshi, B. C. Kumble, Dajiba Desai, Bhauso Raut etc. After independence the council presented appeals to the government.

The report of 'Dar Commission' was published in 1942. The commission approved the scheme of independent Maharashtra at the same time the report stated that Bombay ~~will not be included~~ will not be included in this newly created Maharashtra. On the grounds that since Bombay was the centre of diverse, cultural complex; it must remain as independent state. Further it was stated that the demand of separate Maharashtra on language base was selfish. It may hamper the spirit of democracy and that there will be a chaos and dissatisfaction among the masses.

At the same time the congress conference held at Jaipur showed its ~~xxx~~ resentment towards the report and a

⑤ Ibid - p. 155.

separate committee was set to think over the problem. The committee consisted eminent politicians like ⁶ Jairamdas Doulatram, Vallabhbhai and the president of the Congress Conference Patebhisitaramayya. It was known as 'J.V.P.' Committee. The recommendations made by this committee were rather lenient and still unjustifiable the demand of United Maharashtra including Bombay. The committee stated that the regions on language basis should not be created as yet and if Maharashtra is to be created, it should exclude Bombay. Thus the issue remained unresolved.

Sardar Patel was very proud of Gujrat's Contribution in the making of Bombay as a splendorous city. Naturally the people of Gujrat did not like to include Bombay in United Maharashtra. Thus despite the strong desire of Congress the problem became a prestige issue. Moreover, the leaders of Congress were not ready accept any solution the result of which the question went on perverting Sardar Patel emphatically that Bombay should be included in Gujarath State.

Thus the feelings of the people of Maharashtra were hurt. Most of the people who advocated for such an United Maharashtra were from all corners and walks of life, especially intellectuals, industrialists, and politicians. They felt that the demand is being ignored or neglected purposely.

⁷ Shankarrao Deo, the secretary of All India Congress and Bhausa Hire, supported the demand for Sanyukt Maharashtra.

- ⑥ २५, २७ जनवरी - मंगलूर - ११. २५. ५५. ५१. १८७. परिषद के यंत्रिय ५५
- ⑦ " ५१. १९५

The other congress leaders who supported the demand were, Karkese Gadgil, Yashwantrao Chavan and also opposition leaders Nanasa Gore. Moreover the provocative speeches and affective writings in the newspapers the atmosphere was completely stirred.

In this movement people from all over Maharashtra were involved. Leaders of majority party, opposition leaders journalists respected personalities from both rural and urban area come under a single slogan and emphasised for the 'Sanyukta Maharashtra'. This movement was led under the supervision and the guidance of Yashwantrao Chavan.

Central government nominated a number of commissions to solve this problem, but no satisfactory solution could be evolved out of it. Because of this the problem became more intense and acute.

In order to exclude Bombay from 'Sanyukta Maharashtra' the chief Minister of Maharashtra Morarji Desai, the Bombay region president S. K. Patil, and Gujarati leaders at centre and some independent leaders in Maharashtra tried to convince the congress leaders in Maharashtra to exclude Bombay but it was all in vain. Yashwantrao Chavan while commenting on the report prepared by 'Fazal Ali' commission said that - the only unanimous demand for Sanyukta Maharashtra is including Bombay. Bombay can never be excluded from the newly created Sanyukta Maharashtra.

⑧ अनन्तपुरी - विद्यार्थी-संघ द्वारा २५ मई १९५६ को १३८ नम्बर की प्रार्थना पत्र

The people of Maharashtra were badly disappointed over the report of Fazal Ali commission. Similarly Narendras Dao also suggested at the same time that the contradictory regions like Balgaum and Karwar should be submerged in the respective states only after a massive mandate. On 6th October, 1955, Maharashtra Regional Congress also pressed the demand for Sanyukta Maharashtra.

There was at the last a tremendous controversy over the inclusion of Bombay. Some so called leaders suggested that Bombay may be included in Gujarat, but leaders like Shankarrao Dao, emphatically suggested that it won't be possible. He further said that if a large two-lingual state of Vidharba is acceptable, why should Bombay Gujarat and Maharashtra be not united? The issue, thus was very much debated.

The Movement of Sanyukta Maharashtra :-

When the report of the commission on State organization was published the people all over Maharashtra were quite disappointed. The situation became tense and full of resentment. The president of the Council of Sanyukta Maharashtra Mr. Shankarrao^f Dao asserted that the dream of Sanyukta Maharashtra envisaged by Marathi speaking people has been squandered away for the fulfilment of this aim, action is essential than the words. He realised an immense need for struggle through democratic means.

10

With this effect the Congress working Committee on 14th October, passed a resolution and dictated that the leaders must give up their rigidity and aggressive attitude and should not co-operate or co-opt with other group or party for the attainment of their demands. This created a great problem for Congress Leaders. As a result leaders like Doo Hire and Gadgil, were called by the high command to Delhi for negotiations. Meanwhile Yashwantrao Chavan in one of his addresses delivered at Kared explained the limits of the movement. He told that till the resolution is passed in the Lok Sabha we must support and aspire for Sanyukta Maharashtra. In Democracy we must accept the decisions of the parliament. It is essential to lead the movement by peaceful means and in a democratic fashion.

In the negotiations at Delhi, the delegation of Maharashtra Congress forwarded its original demand. As a unanimous demand the regional Congress of Maharashtra passed a resolution. Yashwantrao Chavan stated that rejection of Maharashtra's justiciable demand is an ultimate insult of Maharashtra. The Government of India by rejecting Bombay for Sanyukta Maharashtra is indirectly supporting the cause of colonialism which goes against the international urge of anti-colonialism. Gujarath even after it has become an independent state is demanding for Bombay. Symbolizes that India is not really against the colonialism.

(10) Ibid - p. 177

(11) Ibid - p. 183.



In two-lingual solution suggested by Dae was rejected by Gujarat. Therefore, the working committee of Congress took a resolution that Maharashtra, Gujarat and Bombay may be created as independent states.

The meeting of the Bombay legislature was to be held on 18th November, 1955. Shankarrao Dae published a pamphlet and suggested the people that they would agitate peacefully. But this agitation proved to be very powerful. Earlier to the meeting of the legislature, the Maharashtra Regional Congress Working Committee, held a meeting in Pune, and decided to review its resolution. In this meeting Yashwantrao Chavan expressed his satisfaction over the progress of the works of Congress and called on the leaders to follow the principles with patience and insisted that strikes and marches would not be helpful to attain the purposes.

Meanwhile majority of the Congress leaders went away from Maharashtra Parishad. Later on the Parishad was dissolved and a new organization as 'Sanyukta Maharashtra Samiti' was established. This new organisation in view of establishing a Sanyukta Maharashtra started movement all over the Maharashtra. All the people from various political parties and groups took active part in the movement.

Editor ~~Dr. Dae~~ wrote a number of articles in 'Aadhari' such as 'Pandit Nehru the Ashwasan', 'Maharashtra's Khambhir Netrutwa', and justified the cause of the people of Maharashtra.

(12) ११.११.५१ - "संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र" २१७
 (13) १०.११.५१ - २७५३.५२.

tra. He stated that in a democratic system the wishes of the ~~INDIA~~ people must get recognition. Nothing should be imposed on them. The people also must pursue their rightful demands through constitutional means. Any movement which is launched for a right cause will become successful in the face of any difficulty. Thus he ensured a confidence among the people. Leaders like Bhausa Hira, Kekase Gadgil, adopted Sattyagraha, Strikes, Morches and tried to draw government attention towards the issue. It was essential to pursue the appeal through the peaceful means and in democratic ways.

The article 'Maharashtrachi Apaksha' published in 'Pudhari' stated that 'one of the major issues before the Congress is whether to agree the demand of the people or to aggravate the feelings of all the people of Maharashtra'. Further it was doubted as to whether Nehru will give up the common welfare principle and see that all the people especially of Maharashtra will get justice. The same kind of thoughts were reflected through articles like 'Maharashtrachya Ehumikata Anapakshit Pethimbe', 'Maharashtrachya Pudhil Sawel', and 'Mumbaicha Keul'. Thus 'Pudhari' has much helped in bringing out the sentiment and opinions of the people. In the municipal Corporation of Bombay, the resolution for Sanyukta Maharashtra including Bombay was passed with 63 votes as against zero. This victory of Maharashtra was very much appreciated in Pudhari under the title 'Sanyukta Maharashtra Mumbai Vijay'.

- (14) Pudhari 8. 11. 55.
 (15) " 24. 11. 55.
 (16) " 24. 12. 55.

On 16th January, 1956, Nairu declared three-state formula according to which the Maharashtra consisted Maha-Gujarat, Bombay and Vidharbha. It does not consist the Marathi speaking region, Bidar, Belgum, Karwar. In 'Chalwalishys Ma Margadarshanachi Jaruri' Pudhari stated that after Bombay was declared as union territory. There was a wide spread of resentment among the people of Maharashtra. People started agitating for their original demand according to which Bombay must be included in 'Sanyukta Maharashtra'. Some severe critics interpreted this resolution as a 'donation of Bombay to some selected capitalists in Bombay'. One week after the declaration of this resolution it was something like religious war. On 15th January at midnight most of the prominent leaders from Congress like Thekare, Krentisinha Nana Patil, S. K. Desai, Krushna Desai, Rasik Bhatt, S. G. Patkar, etc. were arrested. A number of people were shot dead during this controversial period. According to 'Sanyukta Maharashtra' Committee 105 people were killed in this period but the govt. report stated that only 67 to 75 people were killed.

Because of this feeling the scheme of Bi-lingual state started to come into being which was accepted earlier by the leaders of Maharashtra but was rejected by the leaders from Gujarat.

Sanyukta Maharashtra Samiti :-

The Congress party failed in its attempt to achieve Sanyukta Maharashtra and also the Congress working committee

(17) Pndhari 20.11.56

(18) V R. Bhandare "Maharashtra-Karnatak Dispute" p.13.

stopped its co-operation to the movement of Sanyukta Maharashtra, it was very essential to form a new committee as Sanyukta Maharashtra samiti. The committee was set up in Pune on 6th February, 1956, under the presidentship of Shri. Kashewarao Jadhav. Shri. S. M. Joshi, was selected as the Chief Secretary of the Committee. The strength of the members was 27 from various political parties. Mention may be made of Shri. P. V. Gokhale, V. K. Sobti, etc.. In all five resolutions were passed in this committee. The major aim was to include Bombay in newly created Sanyukta Maharashtra. It was unanimously resolved that the committee will pursue its aim with determination and by statutory democratic ways and means. Alongwith twelve opposition parties the major political parties in this committee were Prajasaamajwadi Rightist communist, Shetkari Kamgar Paksha, and Schedule cast federation. Thus the committee became very powerful.

Moreover, because of the resolution for three-states passed in the assembly caused a deep resentment among the people and a 'Morcha' was lead under 'Senapati Bapat'. The Police fired several people injured in the Morcha and thus the Congress people realized the importance of organized struggle for their demands. Leaders like Acharya Attre, Mirajkar were arrested. This policy of the government was highly criticised by the persons like S.M. Joshi, M.S. Palaskar, and on 21st Nov. a complet 'Bandh' was observed.

(19) Ibid. p. 4.

After the Sanyukta Maharashtra Committee started working, its meetings were attended by the leaders like, Attre, and Dange. The committee resolved to demand for a judicial inquiry into the incidents during the movement killing 105 people.

Bi-Lingual Experiment :-

The Bill introducing three separate states was already passed in the parliament. Bombay was to be treated as a separate state. But at the same time juncture Frank, Anthony, Tulshidas, Jadhav and others suggested for Maha-Dwi-Bhashik-People like Ashok Mahta and Acharya Kripalani supported the suggestion. This kind of a solution was already suggested by Shankarrao Deo in 1955. This suggestion later assumed a form of law and the boundary issues related to Belgaum Karwar and Bider all ~~was~~ were left unsolved. The Bill was passed in the parliament on 9th August. This was commented in 'Pudhari' under titles like 'Heach Ka Amachi Lokeshahi' and 'Maharashtrachya Mathi Dwi-Bhashikacha Ghoda'. It was further criticised as a mockery of democracy. At the same time in the article 'Mumbai Babat Tadjod Honar' this resolution was badly criticised.

The whole Gujrat opposed the scheme of 'Vishai Dwibhashik' State. A week in Gujrat 9th August to 15th Aug. was notoriously famous for policefiring in Gujrat. 15 people were killed and some 167 were seriously injured. On 19th Aug.

(20) Pudhari - 28.7.56

Morarji Desai left for Gujrat where the Congress of Gujrat had already rejected the proposal and had demanded for separate Gujrat state. Morarji had to come back in despair. Consequently he went on fast. Then Gujrat committee was established. Gujrati people started agitating for Maha-Gujarat before the Congress Bhawan in Ahmedabad.

On 29th August a conference against the Maha-Dhashik was organised at Shivaji Park. Leaders like Madhavrao Bagel, Bhausa Raut, Senapati Bapat, were present. Representatives from Gujrat also were present. S. M. Joshi renewed the works of the committee in the conference. It was found that forty-five thousand people had to go to jail. One hundred and twenty five people from Gujrat and Maharashtra were killed and thirty two M.L.A.S. had to resign. The figure clearly showed that the elections which were to be held in 1957 would meet on extreme failure.

Morarji Bhai Desai was reluctant to continue as chief Minister of Maharashtra therefore Yeshwantrao Chavan assumed the position of C.M. Greater Bombay state on 1st Nov. 1956 In order to convince the people for the Bi-lingual state Yeshwantrao delivered speeches throughout.- Marathwada, Vidharbha, Gujrath, Sourashtra etc. Yet Gujrat sticked to the demand for a separate Gujrat State.

The Massive election of 1957 :-

This year was glorious in the view of the establishment of the ^{Sanjyukta maharashtra.} Committee. The challenge of 'Dwibhashik' was

accepted by both by Sanyukta Maharashtra Committee and by the Maha Gujrat Samiti. Both the committees started preparing for the elections which were to be held in the first quarter of 1957. The future of Sanyukta Maharashtra was depending on the results of the elections. Yeshwantrao Chavan was in a dilemma because there was a very few time to win over the people confidence. This election of 1957 created a new history in the politics of Maharashtra especially in it's wide ranging propoganda.

In the elections ^{the Congress} leaders from Western Maharashtra were defeated but the committee was remarkably successful. Thirty seven lakh people voted the committee. Congress won twenty four lakhs, committee won 111 seats, congress won 36 seats. For the Lok Sabha the Samiti out of 22 and in Vidharbha it got 8 seats. Congress seats were in majority in Gujrat, Kachna and Sourashtra. Yeshwantrao Chavan also remained as a C.M. The election proved the fact that the people are against the Dwibhashik. The government realized the protest of the people in the election of 1957.

21
Pudhari in three articles titled 'Maharashtrat Congresscha Parabhav', 'Lokmatacha Koul Mannar Ki Nahi', and 'Dwibhashikancha Far Vichar Nahi' critics that by considering public will the problem of Sanyukta Maharashtra must be solved with divided policy and principles. As the public will was ignored, it resulted that in the elections people of Western

21) Pudhari 17.3.57.

Maharashtra resulted against bi-linguistic states. This must be noticed by the statesmen and party elites.

Sanvukta Maharashtra :-

During the ^{inaugural} function of Maharashtra University Nehru indirectly stated that considering failure of congress in Vidhansabha and Loksabha, elections. Govt. is giving to re-think over dilemma of bi-linguistic state.

²²
Pudhari also reacted to this situation in the article 'Vishal Maharashtra'. He states that Linguistic state is the main principle of development of democracy. Congress had begged for linguistic states. Since long time. In the Homeless movement of Lokmanya Tilak the first reference was given to the establishment of linguistic states. Even in the freedom movement by Congress, the same was demanded and preferential demand of linguistic states. In this article Pudhariker had made them aware of their own principles. He also stated that Language and democracy are the two sides of one coin and he made political leaders aware of their duty. In the article ²³ 'Dillitil Morche' it is stated by Pudhari that on December, 12, 1959 the opposite party brought stay in ~~at~~ Lok-sabha on this problem. So prime minister visited Bombay and Aurangabad and understood the public mind and realised that demand of bi-linguistic should not be kept hanging.

In the Congress conference of Chandigarh by the end of September, 1959, Indira Gandhi appointed a committee of

²² Pudhari 27.8.59.

²² " 22.2.59.

nine members to consider the problem of bi-linguistic state. This committee gave report about the breaking of bi-linguistic state. Congress working committee discussed this report on 3rd December, 1959. The working committee passed a resolution on the breaking of bi-linguistic and into separate of Gujrat and Maharashtra states. Parliament passed a resolution to create Gujrat and Bombay an independent states. 'Vidharbha' was affiliated to Maharashtra, as per 'Nagpur' Y. B. Chavan taking into consideration of public will he changed the name of old Bombay state as Maharashtra Rajya on March, 15, 1960. Pandit Nehru inaugurated the new states of Maharashtra on April 30, 1960, at 12.1 a.m. at night, in 'Raj-Bhavan'. In this day struggle of birth of Maharashtra with Bombay is capital has capitulated. Puchari was pleased for the success of Maharashtra and gave best compliments to the newly born State of Maharashtra. This shows that government never pays attention unless the common people were on the street and struggle for their rights. The public will can do and undo something creative and benifitting.

Maharashtra and Karnataka Border Conflict and Puchari :-

If the purposely committed mistakes of political leaders are not amended in the nick of time, then it becomes tense and difficult. The good example of it is of border issue between Maharashtra and Karnataka.

The Role of Puchari on Border Problem :-

As late former chief Minister Y.B. Chavan tried his level best to solve the border problem. so also daily puchari This paper had pleaded in the articles time to time how this

question is closely related with the cultural, emotive and language life of the people. But as the people were burnt up by the problem of Bombay to include in United Maharashtra like wise they did not take it seriously in case of Belgaum problem. Even it is stated by S. M. Joshi that it is realised that border problem has been put to an end. During this dealing period who Pudhari kept this problem alive and supported the people of border area. Pudhari has been always touching to their problems by his own sharp pen. We do not know when the border problem would be solved, why through the stand which is takes by pudhari right from bagining, has yst not changed. Comparing to other papers the role of Pudhari in this matter worthy of consideration. Pudhari has given inspiration to disinterested people to take interest in the boiling question. Even the papers like Sakal, Sagar, Jansarathi and Belgaum Tarun Bherat have tried their level to raise up this problem.

24

In the article titled 'Karnatakatil Marathi, Bhashikavaril Second Anyaya' Pudhari has exposed the low policy of birth of constituency. It was set up like this that the representative from the border of area should not elected to participate in the cabinet. In the article 'Pantpradhanani Sima Pradeshachi Dekhal Chetali' it has been said that is it not the function or duty of ~~central~~ central Government to take out coincidently joined land to Mysore, to Join Maharashtra? It this question is to be thought seriously

24) Pudhari 17.2.56

25) " 24.9.57.

then with justice and without partiality it should be solved. In this article government is made aware of this problem. How Karnataka has government given treatment to the people of Border area is stated in the article 'Marathi Bhagatil Kanadinchi Akraman ?' All Marathi officers have been changed and Kanada Officers have been placed to have Kanadikarah. Here public and Government relations are absolutely broken up and a very strange picture of less responsible democratic picture has been created. It is stated in the article 'Maysore Sarakarachi Sabadi Vaganuk'. Here ill-treated and its effect is public unrest. So this public unrest should not become danger for the national integrity. Govt. should take drastic action to solve this problem. The dictatorship of Mysore Government has been bitterly criticised in the article titled 'Maysore Sarakaracha Nishedh Ase' so this problem must be solved without creating the conflict of language. In the Article 'Sima Prashna Sutat Nahi Dusmat Ahe'. Pudhari has made request to central government to relieve border people from the inhuman colonism of Karnataka Government. In the article 'Maysore Sarakaracha Vesनावद' Pudarhikar states that unless the colonism is banished, Indian people will never enjoy the freedom in real sense. The public which entombed unjust ruling power of foreigner, would never bear such colonism policy of Karnataka Government. In brief it is made clear that Karnataka government plays dual policy and crushed the people. So daily Pudhari has played very important role to protect the democratic principle and wishing of the people of this area.

REFERENCES.

- 1) Joshi S. M. (Ed) & Pradhan G. P., Lokmitra, May 1963, P. 95.
- 2) Shivaji University, Kolhapur (Ed). Bharatiya Swatantrya Chalwalicha Itihas, Prakashak-Kulsachiv, Shivaji University, Kolhapur, 1972, P. 45.
- 3) Jadhav and Sawant, Bharatiya Swatantrya Chalwalicha Itihas, Prakashak-Pragati Agency, Pune, 1978, P.171.
- 4) Kulkarni Bhimrao (Ed). Asmita Maharashtrachi, Prakashak-G. G. Gawade, Dpty.President Maratha Mandir, Bombay, Nov. 1971, PP. 152, 155.
- 5) Joshi ~~and~~ S. M., M. S. M., Atmakatha, Continental Prakashan, 1984, PP. 187, 195.
- 6) Ibid, PP. 217 to 219.
- 7) Ibid, P. 230.
- 8) Joshi R., Yeshwantrao Chavan Itihasiche Eka Pan, Kesari Prakashan, Pune, 1976, PP. 139, 173.
- 9) Ibid, PP. 177, 183.
- 10) Babar K. B., Yeshwantrao Chavan Vaiyakati Ani Karya, Kesari, Prakashan Pune, 1960, PP. 74, 75.
- 11) Ibid, P. 232.
- 12) Bokil Santaram, Mahajan Ahawalavar Prakashzot, Prakashak-Prakasi Mali, Kolhapur, 1985. P. 8.
- 13) Juvekar Malleash, A brief Note on Maharashtra-Kernataka Border issue, Sachiv M. S., Skikaran Samiti, Belgum, 85.

- 14) Bhandare V. R., Maharashtra Karnataka Bordar Disputa
Politics of Manipulation, Kirti Prakashan, Bombay.
P. 1 to 5.
- 15) Bhosale S. S., Padharikar S. G., Jadhav Gauravagrantha,
Baburao Dharawade, President S. G. Jadhav Amrit
Mahotsav, Samiti, Kolhapur, 1982.
- 16) Phadake Y. D., Maharashtra, Illusion and Reality, article
published by Shivaji University, Kolhapur, 1985.

पुढारीतील अग्रलिख.

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| १७] भाषावार प्रांतरचना व दाखंडी. | १५ फेब्रु. १९५१. |
| १८] पं. नेहरो आशवासन व महाराष्ट्राचे
खंबीर नेतृत्व. | २० मार्च १९५२
३० सप्टें. १९५५. |
| १९] महाराष्ट्राला खच्चीकरण करण्याचे कारस्थान | १० ऑक्टो. १९५५. |
| २०] महाराष्ट्राची अपेक्षा. | ८ नोव्हें. १९५५. |
| २१] महाराष्ट्राच्या भूमिकेत पाठिंबा. | २४ नोव्हें. १९५५. |
| २२] महाराष्ट्रातुडील तवाल. | १० डिसें. १९५५. |
| २३] मुंबईचा काँल. | २२ डिसें. १९५५. |
| २४] संयुक्त महाराष्ट्राचा मुंबईत अपूर्व विजय. | २४ डिसें. १९५५. |
| २५] मुंबईत संयुक्त महाराष्ट्रच पाहिजे. | १ जाने. १९५६. |
| २६] मुंबईचा काँल. | ४ फेब्रु. १९५६. |
| २७] आजचा संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र दिन. | १६ फेब्रु. १९५६. |
| २८] चळवळीच्या मार्गदर्शनाची जरूरी. | २० जाने. १९५६. |
| २९] हीच का आजची लोकावाही. १ | २८ जुलै. १९५६. |
| ३०] महाराष्ट्राच्या माथी दिमाखीकांचा पोंडा. | ९ ऑगस्ट, १९५६. |
| ३१] मुंबई बाबत तडजोड छोणार. | २६ एप्रिल, १९५६. |

- ३२] लोकमत विचारांत घेणार का नाही ? १२ फेब्रु. १९५६.
- ३३] यथावंतरावांचे अभिनंदणीय यत्न. ६ मार्च, १९५७.
- ३४] महाराष्ट्रात काँग्रेसचा प्रचंड पराभव. १७ मार्च, १९५७.
- ३५] लोकमताचा कौल मान्यार की नाही ? २७ मार्च, १९५७.
- ३६] रिभाषिकांचा फेर विचार नाही. ३० मार्च, १९५७.
- ३७] विद्याल महाराष्ट्र. २७ ऑगस्ट, १९५९.
- ३८] दिल्लीचा मोर्चा. २२ डिसें. १९५८.
- ३९] कर्नाटकातील मराठी भाषिकांवर दुसरा अन्याय. १९ डिसें. १९५६.
- ४०] पंतप्रधानांनी पंजाब प्रदेशाची दखल घेतली. २४ सप्टें. १९५७.
- ४१] मराठी भागांत कानडीचे आक्रमण. १२ जाने. १९५८.
- ४२] स्टैसूर सरकारची सानदी वागणूक. २० नोव्हें. १९५८.
- ४३] स्टैसूर सरकारचा निरोध. २५ नोव्हें. १९५८.
- ४४] सीमाप्रश्न निटला नाही, धुसत आहे. २९ नोव्हें. १९५८.
- ४५] स्टैसूर सरकारचा वताहत वाद. २३ ऑक्टोब. १९५८.
- ४६] डेळगांवचा सत्याग्रह. ११ मार्च, १९५६.
- ४७] सीमा सत्याग्रहाचे ठिकाण. २६ ऑगस्ट, १९५६.
- ४८] डेळगांवची सीमा परीषद. २ एप्रिल, १९७३.
- ४९] सीमा प्रश्न सुटणार तरी केंव्हा ? ४ एप्रिल, १९५९.
- ५०] सीमा प्रदेशात असदारांची भेट. ८ मे, १९५९.
- ५१] आता विलंब नैकी. १ नोव्हें. १९७४.
- ५२] सीमा भागातील हुतात्मा दिन संदेश. १७ जाने. १९७३.
- ५३] आश्विनपूर्णिमेची अवेक्षा. १७ जाने. १९७५.