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DYARCHY IN MADRAS.

An Epoch-making Event: The introduction of the Dyarchical system of provincial government in the Madras Presidency was an epoch-making event not only in the history of provincial constitutional growth but also in the development of Local Self Government. It was an important stage in the constitutional history of the Madras Presidency because the Government of India Act 1919 transferred a number of provincial subjects to be administered by the provincial government with the power to make laws in respect to them and without the crippling control of the Government of India over the provincial government. It was also a significant event in the development of local self government because for the first time during the British rule the local bodies were brought under popular control.

Since Local Self Government was a 'transferred' subject under Dyarchy it came under the charge of a popular Minister responsible to the provincial Legislature with elected majority. Popular ministry was given the constitutional power to shape local Government policy and practice by introducing new legislation towards this end. The changed complexion of the provincial legislature and the
unique opportunity that provincial political personalities
got to give currency to their ideas exercised a profound
influence on the development of Local Self Government in
the Madras Province. Moreover, the working of the Dyarchical
experiment presupposed the introduction of party politics in
the Presidency and division of elected members of the
legislature into distinct parties. Thus, unlike the pre-
reform Councils, the new Reformed Council had to face the
Ministerial party and official opposition party or parties
with policies of their own. In short, the Montford Reforms
provided an opportunity to the provincial government to
promote Local Self-Government not merely as an instrument of
political and popular education or a training ground for
national leadership but also an organic growth of the pro-
vincial political system to meet the needs of tradition and
suit the genius of the people.

Since local government had always been a creature of
provincial government an understanding of the condition and
composition of the contemporary Legislative Council, the
party system that was responsible for the functioning of
the legislature and running the government and the prevail-
ing political atmosphere which promoted or retarded the
development of Local Self-Government is essential to appreci-
ate the interrelationship between the progress or otherwise
of rural local self-government and provincial politics during
the period under study.
Montagu's Visit to Madras: E.S. Montagu, Secretary of State for India (1917-1922) made his most momentous policy declaration on 20th August 1917. It stated that "the policy of His Majesty's Government is that of the increasing association of Indians in every branch of administration and the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to progressive realisation of responsible government in India as the integral part of the British Empire". Lord Chelmsford, the Viceroy (1916-1921) elaborated the theme in his speech to the Central Legislative Council the following month: "The domain of urban and rural self-government is the great training ground from which political progress and a sense of responsibility have taken their start ... it is time ... to accelerate the rate of progress and thus to stimulate the responsibility in the average citizen and to educate his experience".

With a view to giving effect to the new policy of the British Government and to assess the mind and mood of the Indian public on the proposed reforms, Montague visited India at the close of 1917. He arrived at Madras on 14 December 1917. The historic visit of the Secretary of State to the Presidency activated the political groupings as well as the provincial government to present their claims and counter-claims before the visiting dignitary. The Home Rulers, the Congressmen, the members of the Madras Provincial Association, the Justicites and the Madras Government headed by Pentland had
all worked hysterically at cross-purposes and made Madras politics highly complicated. Montague after a grueling round of hectic talks, interviews and discussions with the political personalities and officials concerned noted in his Diary with disgust and disillusionment: "I leave Madras with a heavy heart. It seems to me hopeless. Hence, if anywhere, officials administer and do not govern .... Madras is not the same place that it was five years ago. Brahmins and non-Brahmins, English and Indians - all have been set at loggerheads." For Madras Presidency was in the grip of communal politics!

**Mont-ford Formulae:** After the completion of Montagu's Indian tour along with the Viceroy Lord Chelmsford, the Joint Report on Indian Constitutional Reforms (Montagu-Chelmsford or Montford Report) was issued in 22 April, 1918. The authors of the Report recommended the following four-fold formulae for carrying out the new policy of the British Government:

1. "There should be, as far as possible complete popular control in local bodies and the largest possible independence for them of outside control".

2. "The provinces are the domain in which the earlier steps towards the realization of responsible government should be taken ".
3. "The Government of India must remain wholly responsible to Parliament .... "

4. " .... the control of Parliament and the Secretary of State over the Government of India and provincial governments must be relaxed". 6

The Montford proposal was a definite, distinct and substantial departure from the policy hitherto followed by the British Government in the governance of India. The proposal was widely discussed and debated in the press and on the platform. After a most elaborate examination of the Report by the Joint Select Committee of both Houses of Parliament, the Government of India Act, 1919 was passed on 23 December, 1919.

The Government of India Act, 1919 or the Montford Reforms definitely introduced the principle of political responsibility though the extent and scope of its action were to be limited. 7 However, the Montford Reforms constitute:"the fourth and greatest drive in the preindependence days to establish a general system of responsible local government, although their primary objective was at the provincial rather than at the local level". 8 Though the Report was primarily concerned with provincial sphere it arrived at the conclusion that throughout the current structure of Local Self Government the educative principles had been subordinated to the desire for other results of an
immediate nature. The Report sought, as far as possible, complete popular control over local bodies and their maximum independence from interference from outside. In short, the Montford Reforms left the destiny of Local Self Government to be designed by the popular provincial government.

Provinces of Province: "Since Queen Victoria's proclamation of 1858 Mr. Montagu's statement was the first major attempt to define the goal of British policy in India ... Mr. Montagu's statement blazed a new trail". The new trail blazed lay in the sphere of provincial administration. The Montford Report considered the provinces as a suitable area for the experimentation and "progressive realisation of responsible government" and "this involves at once giving the provinces the largest measure of independence-legislative, administrative and financial—of the Government of India which is compatible with the due discharge by the latter of its own responsibilities". Thus, the position, powers and status of the provincial government was significantly raised by the Government of India Act, 1919. In short, it could not function with a large measure of independence and "this independence belonged to them by right and not by the grace of the Supreme Government." The Montford Reforms introduced, what is known as Dual Government or Dyarchy in the Madras Presidency. The "Devolution Rules" made under the Government of India Act, 1919 applied
to the legislative, administrative and financial spheres of the Madras Government along with other eight Governor's Provinces.\textsuperscript{13} According to the classification of functions\textsuperscript{14} laid down in the Devolution Rules; 52 items were declared to be provincial subjects.\textsuperscript{15} These were subdivided into 'reserved' and 'transferred' subjects, the former being administered by the Governor and his Executive Council while the latter by Ministers chosen by the Governor from among the elected members of the Legislative Council. Among the 'transferred' subjects the prime importance was accorded to Local Self-Government.\textsuperscript{16}

The Madras Legislative: A unicameral and triennial legislature called Legislative Council was set up in the Presidency. The Council consisted of a) elected members, b) representatives of Indian and European Chambers of Commerce and c) nominated members of backward classes and of officials and (d) Executive Councillors, who were ex-officio members. Membership strength of the Madras Legislative Council was increased from 47 to 132 and its elective membership from 19 to 90. Excluding the ex-officio members the total strength of the Council was 127.\textsuperscript{17} Thus, the very composition of the Madras Legislative Council was altered in favour of representatives of diverse interests. Not only was substantial elected majority installed in the provincial legislature but also invested with vastly increased powers. With all the inherent limitations imposed by the very nature of Dyarchy, the Madras Legislature for
the first time became a truly responsible popular ruling body. It may be aptly described as 'sovereign body in posses' and was no longer "the advisory durbar of the pre-
mentford era".¹⁸

**First Elections under Dyarchy:** The first elections under Dyarchy were held in the Madras Presidency in December, 1920. The enlarged electorate participated in an election fought for the first time on party basis over specific issues. The election was, however, boycotted by the Congress for reasons that will be explained later. With the Congress party out of the field, the Justice party swept the polls without any difficulty whatsoever. Out of 98 elected seats, the Justice Party members won 63.¹⁹ Thus out of the total of 127 members of the Madras Legislative Council 98 were elected and 29 were nominated. Of the 98 elected members, the Madras Chamber of Commerce and the Madras Trades Association, both controlled by European merchants, elected 3 from an electorate of less than 200; the English planters had one seat; then there was one European seat for the Madras Presidency and one for the Anglo-Indians, giving the Government 6 votes as secure as those of their nominated officials. The remaining nominated (29) members were officials and non-officials and Executive Councillors.

True, the Justice Party was returned with a clear
majority over all other groups in the legislature. Nevertheless, it had to depend upon the support of the Government nominees to press through their progressive, though controversial, measures. In fact, it was only with the support of Government nominees that the Justice Party was able to claim a total strength of 81 out of 127 members of the Legislative Council. The contention, therefore, that the "Justice Party formed a single party which had the support of the majority in the legislature and did not therefore depend on official support or look for the support of nominated and other members for its survival," is not borne out by facts. With the willing co-operation and enthusiastic support of the Government and the bureaucracy only, the Justice Party was in a position to enact legislation on Local Self-Government along with other 'transferred' subjects.

PROVINCIAL POLITICS AND POLITICAL PARTIES:

National Reaction: During the period under study, Madras Provincial politics got inextricably mixed up with national politics; and even the local self-governing institutions were drawn into the vortex of national political agitations. Provincial political parties and other groups were profoundly influenced by the decisions of the Indian National Congress. The August Declaration of Montagu (1917) evoked a favourable reaction from the different sections of the Indian National Congress. "The evidence submitted before the Joint Committee of the two Houses, on behalf of
the leading political organisations of the country, clearly showed that ... there was every desire to work the reforms for what they are worth". 23 In the Amritsar Congress (1919) Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya and Gandhi" wanted to work the Reforms on the basis of offering co-operation in the measure in which Government co-operated with the people". 24 Gandhi even "went out of his way to respond loyally and gratefully" to the sentiments expressed in the king's proclamations inaugurating "the new era". 25 The Congress liberals and the moderate Nationalists, though criticised many of its provisions, were still prepared to work the Reform. The left-wing Nationalists headed by Bal Gangadhar Tilak met in his house in May 1919 and "unanimously agreed that every opportunity provided by the new Reforms should be utilised to the fullest extent. Mr. Tilak himself agreed to stand for a constituency". 26

But within a year, by May 1920, the entire national political atmosphere underwent a sea change! Qualified optimism, friendliness and goodwill towards giving a fair trial to the Montford Reforms yielded place to dark pessimism, antagonism and ill will. The laborious efforts of Montague and the prospects of implementing the Government of India Act, 1919 received a rude set back. The passing of the Rowlatt Act (March, 1919); 27 the massacre of Jallianwala Bagh (April, 1919), and the Turkish Treaty (May, 1920) which led to the Khilaphat agitation contributed
to the metamorphosis of national outlook towards the Reforms. The Special Congress session at Calcutta (4-9 Sep. 1920), attended by a huge gathering of 20,000 persons, including 5,000 delegates representing all the provinces, endorsed though after considerable controversy, Gandhiji's Non-co-operation Resolution. 28

The Special Session of the Calcutta Congress demanded among other things a) "... resignation of nominated posts in local bodies; b) "... withdrawal by candidates from election to the reformed Councils and c) "refusal on the part of the voters to vote for any candidate who may, despite the Congress advice, offer himself for election." 29 The events that were fast developing intensified the schism amongst the Congressmen so much so that the year 1920 opened with a definite cleavage of parties in Indian politics. And the working of the Reformed constitution synchronised with the non-cooperation movement headed by Gandhiji. The public attention in the country tended to be focussed on "the limitations which characterised the Reforms and the to ignore the opportunities they offered". 30 What was the Madras response to the Montford Reforms?

PROVINCIAL RESPONSE:

The Home Rule League: Political agitation began with a bang in the Madras Presidency with the rise of the Home Rule League. Dr. Mrs. Annie Besant, the founder of
the Home Rule League, was largely responsible for the creation of political awareness among the people of the Presidency in the early years of the present century. With surprising speed the activities of the League were extended to the length and breadth of the province. Thanks to the inspiring zeal of Dr. Annie Besant and the untiring efforts and support of Mr. Arundale, Mr. Wadia, Sir S. Subramania Iyer, Right Honourable V.S. Srinivasa Sastri, the League captured the imagination of many intellectuals, young and old alike.

The Home Rule Leaguers preached everywhere the objects of the League viz., Responsible Government (Home Rule) at all levels, Swadeshi, boycott of foreign goods, temperance, national education, labour welfare etc. These ideals were, of course, similar in essence to those propounded by the Indian National Congress. In fact, Mrs. Annie Besant looked upon the Home Rule League as "an auxiliary to the Indian National Congress". The League's powerful newspaper 'New India' and its numerous pamphlets effectively propagated the objectives of the league among the educated. By conducting Home Rule classes, organizing Boys scouts and Volunteer troops and converting the Theosophical Society itself into a political organisation, Dr. Besant brought into the agitational politics of Madras hundreds of teachers, students, Government servants, social workers and intellectuals. The Theosophical Lodges set up in the
districts "served as centres of political agitation". The 'red hot agitation' for self-government soon "began to spread like wild fire from district to district." Thousand of Home Rule Pledges were signed by those who were inspired by the League. The Home Rule movement, which was active between 1916 and 1918, merged itself into the main stream of national politics when Gandhiji's non-co-operation movement enveloped the country.

Dr. Annie Besant was a constitutionalist. Though she saw eye to eye with Gandhiji in so far as the freedom of the country was concerned, she differed from him regarding Non-Cooperation. "The peaceful surroundings of her mansion at Adyar ... she exploded against Gandhi and almost endorsed Sankaran Nair's view that the Mahatma was leading the country to anarchy." Dr. Besant subscribed to the Montford Scheme. "She promised to accept anything that Sir Sankaran Nair accepted and Sir Sankaran Nair accepted the Montford Scheme". Mrs. Besant's Home Rule scheme aimed at securing Swaraj through the agency of Legislative councils. J.T. Gwynn, a contemporary reporter of political events forecasted: "... Mrs. Annie Besant, who has now for two years (1920-1922) been devoting her energy to the twin tasks of warning against the Non-Brahmin party and making a success of the Reforms ... Outside the ranks of the non-cooperators there is a political force in the country which might upset all calculations. That is Dr. Annie
Besant. Since the Reformed Constitution came into being she had worked to make it thrive and grow." But unfortunately she could not grow into a powerful political force to work out the Montford Reforms.

Dr. Annie Besant was an uncompromising champion of self-government at all levels. She passionately pleaded that the nation ought to be governed by her own people elected by herself. She was a tireless advocate of the revival of rural local self-government. Dr. Besant saw in Indian village institutions such as panchayats a system of indigenous local government which had given Indians many centuries of training in the art of self-government. "British rule has destroyed her village and Council Government", wrote Dr. Besant, "and has put in its place a hybrid system of Boards and Councils which are important for good, because well-informed Indian opinion is over-ruled by officials who come, knowing nothing of India and seek to impose English methods on an ancient land which has its own traditions. They then complain that their hybrid is sterile. It is they way with hybrids. India wants to rebuild and improve her own system, beginning with Panchayats, and working upwards untrammelled by foreign experts". In her Presidential address to the All India Congress Committee, "an elaborate thesis of India's Self-Government", Dr. Annie Besant presented a detailed Bill regarding Village Government.
Dr. Besant's Home Rule League, however, singularly failed to take advantage of the Reformed Constitution and translate its conviction about Local Self-Government into political reality. The cause of Local Self-Government thereby lost one of its doughty champions!

The Provincial Congress: "India entered an age of mass politics in 1920 when Mahatma Gandhi launched the first national civil disobedience movement. Even since, politics and government have been a part of the central core of Indian life." The Madras provincial Congress was the mirror image of the Indian National Congress with all its strength and weakness. When the monolithic National Congress was divided, on the issue of the Montford Reforms, into Non-changers and Pro-changers, it had its inevitable repercussions on the Madras Congress politics. The Madras Provincial Congress suffered a severe split over council entry issue; the group of Non-changers was led by C. Rajagopalachari and the group of Pro-changers by Kasturi Ranga Iyengar, S. Srinivasa Iyengar, A. Rangaswami Iyengar and S. Satyamurti.

C. Rajagopalachari stood steadfast against the council entry and remained to the last and uncompromising champions of the Gandhian Non-Co-operation movement. Similarly, the Pro-changers continued to remain equally unyielding in opposing the Non-changers and all the "Skillful maneuvering and manipulation" of the provincial Congress controlled by C. Rajagopalachari. This disagreement between the two groups,
manifested well in advance of the Special Calcutta Congress Session, and the consequent division in the ranks of Madras Congress leadership sapped the strength of the party in the province.

S. Satyamurti and Kasturi Ranga Iyengar, two of the prominent Pro-changers, desired to contest the election of 1920, but later decided to abide by the resolution of the Madras Provincial Congress Committee supporting Non-co-operation. The Resolution was passed at the instance of C. Rajagopalachari who used it as a "tactical weapon" against Pro-changers. This confrontation among the leaders of Madras Congress continued unabated and even carried on to the Calcutta Congress session. On returning from Calcutta Kasturi Ranga Iyengar resigned his presidency of the Madras Pradesh Congress committee and S. Satyamurti from his secretaryship. This inner-party rivalry resulted in the ineffective boycott of the elections in 1920. In short, in the Tamil districts it was not possible to make Council entry issue an official Congress policy.

Further, the Madras Congress was caught in the coils of internal squabbles. The reconstitution of the Madras Pradesh Congress Committee representing all the Tamil Districts provided fresh fuel to the power struggle among the congress leaders in the Presidency. Kasturi Ranga Iyengar, S. Satyamurti and A. Rengaswami Iyengar accused C. Rajagopalachari of having rigged the Committee election so that he could retain his hold over the party. There was also discontent
over the handling of the Congress funds. The opponents of C. Rajagopalachari were excluded from the Madras Provincial Congress Committee.

The Chauri Chaura incident (4, Feb. 1922) and the consequent suspension of the Non-Co-operation movement by Gandhi virtually put an end to the non-cooperation movement in the Tamil districts. After the arrest of Gandhi on 10 March, 1922 the Non-cooperation practically petered out in this part of the country. And yet C. Rajagopalachari was carrying the torch of Non-Cooperation undaunted! From the time of the Non-Cooperation movement of 1919 - 1921 to the time of the Civil - Disobedience movement of 1930 - 1931, people's interest in the Congress creed was sustained in the Presidency by the persistent propaganda carried on by the Congress. One important contribution made by the Non-Cooperation Movement was the starting of the Congress Committees all over the Presidency. All these Committees carried on a silent propaganda and non-violent agitation including the boycott of the Reformed Council and local bodies in the Presidency. The formal abandonment of Non-Cooperation, therefore, instead of reconciling the conflict between the rival groups in the congress, aggravated the disagreement between the No-changers and the Pre-changers. For instance, when a month after Gandhi's arrest, C. Raja-Gopalachari and his supporters attempted to continue the programme of civil disobedience, S. Satyanurti and his followers
insisted that Congress should endeavour to win seats in the elections to secure access to a "potent means for compelling ... the advent of Swaraj."\textsuperscript{52}

The Congress boycott in general and boycott of elections in particular was not a significant success. It had no notable effect in the Presidency except enabling the Justice Party members to get elected in large numbers to the Legislative Council. In spite of many appeals from the Vernacular Press and Congress leaders, there was a conspicuous "lack of interest in the boycott" to the disappointment and dismay of many a Congress leader.\textsuperscript{53} Even C. Rajagopalachari, an uncompromising Champion of the non-cooperation movement had to observe that "Disobedience is going on in a slow way in Tamil Nadu".\textsuperscript{54} Another perceptive observer of the political scene had noted in a letter to The Hindu that the presence of the Justice Party made the boycott of the Legislative Council an "extraordinarily difficult sacrifice".\textsuperscript{55} As for the Local Self-Government, the wave of the Non-Cooperation politics in Madras affected the Corporation of Madras and other municipalities to a great extent but "outside the Presidency towns, national politics were sharply reproduced in local affairs in some big towns, less sharply in others and hardly at all in the countryside".\textsuperscript{56}

The Swaraj Party: Reference is made elsewhere\textsuperscript{57} to the split of the Indian National Congress over the Council
entry issue and its repercussion on the Madras Provincial Congress. The unilateral suspension of the Non-Cooperation Movement by Gandhi served only to widen the gap between the Non-changers and Pro-changers. The Pro-changers dominated the provincial political scene respectively at different periods of time in the Madras Presidency: Kasturi Ranga Iyengar in the early twenties, S. Srinivasa Iyengar in the later twenties and by S. Satyamurti in the thirties. S. Srinivasa Iyengar was the first to call Gandhi's Non-cooperation movement 'unjust', a remark which caused consternation among many Madras Congressmen. Thiru Vi. Kalyanasundaram, one of the leading congressmen and a prominent member of the Madras Presidency Association, appealed to him to remove the apprehension about his reported remark and desist from entering the Legislative Council. But S. Srinivasa Iyengar contested the seat reserved for Madras University in the Legislative Council and won.

S. Satyamurti played a notable role in mobilising the party as well as the public opinion in favour of Council entry. True, the Pro-changers did not participate in the 1920 elections. But S. Satyamurti persisted in his stand and he declared in the Tamil Nad Congress Committee meeting held a month after Gandhi's arrest (10, March, 1922) that the Legislative Council was a potent means to achieve Swaraj and the nation could not afford to ill spend the 'limited amount of political energy and enthusiasm' on endeavours which had
no effect. It was S. Satyanarayana who suggested the need to form a party within the Congress which would adopt Council entry as its creed. He believed that the non-participation in the election of 1923 would be a "political suicide for another four years". He even carried the Council entry crusade to the Gaya Congress held in December, 1922. Having lost the battle there, the Pre-changers formed the Swaraj Party on 1st January, 1923.

The election manifesto of the Swaraj Party issued by Motilal Nehru on 14th October, 1923 described the new party as "a party within the Congress. It is not and was never intended to be a rival organisation". Without questioning the principle of non-cooperation the party proposed "to carry the good fight into the enemy's camp by entering the Councils". There was a growing sentiment among the intellectuals in favour of Council entry as there was disillusionment among the moderates with the working of the Reforms. The special session of the Congress held in Delhi during mid-September, 1923 under the Presidentship of Abdul Kalam Azad found it possible to bring about a compromise between the non-changers and the Swarajists by permitting the Swaraj Party to function within the Congress and "to stand as candidates and to exercise the right of voting at the forthcoming elections ...." Thus the revolt at Gaya bore fruit and the way was "clear to those who were inclined to take part in the ensuing elections and Congressmen were for the first time divided in
their attention to a programme which itself was divided in its course. 68

Since the Swarajists remained and worked within the Congress the infighting between the No-changers and the Swarajists was intensified. Mastering support for one's own side became a characteristic feature of Madras Congress politics and it persisted for a long time. While C. Rajagopalachari and his followers were keeping the Non-cooperation alive, the Madras Swarajists were busy preparing for the coming elections. When C.R. Das undertook a three week lecture tour in the Presidency in 1923 he found to his delight that the people of Madras had become "the strongest supporters of his Council entry programme". 69 In all his speeches he emphasised the imperative necessity to participate in the new Councils in order to obstruct the Government. 70 With a view to stabilise the Madras wing of the Swaraj Party by getting the support of the Non-Brahmins, C.R.Das even presided over the Non-Brahmin Round Table Conference held at Coimbatore and enlisted the support of powerful Non-brahmins like Sir R.K.Shanmugam Chetty and Dr.P. Varadarajulu Naidu for the Justice Party.

There was also an argument between Dr. P.Varadarajulu Naidu and S. Srinivasa Iyengar that the Congress should accept office in the Provinces if the spirit of Dyarchical set up was to be abrogated. 71

The Swaraj Party participated in the 1923 election and was able to win eleven seats only, a victory absolutely
inadequate to wreck the Legislative Council from within. Nevertheless it was an important beginning for a party that fought against the Justice Party and was to challenge it in and out of the legislature. Subsequently the Swarajist Party strengthened its organisation and it spread its branches "down from the capital to the districts, the towns and villages". It also perfected its election campaign techniques with a view to bring "politics down from the Gokhale Hall to the beach, from the club to the street corner". The result was that the Swarajist Party won 42 seats in 1927 adding 30 more to its previous performance.

The Swaraj Party, however, refused to accept office. C.V.S.Narasimha Raju, the Swaraj Party leader in the Legislative Council, declined the Governor's invitation to form the Ministry. The Raja of Panagal, leader of the Justice Party, also refused to form the Ministry on the ground that it would not be possible for him to retain office in the face of the Swarajist opposition. This piquant situation led to the formation of an Independent Ministry by Dr. P. Subbarayan, an erstwhile member of the Justice Party, now elected as an Independent in the 1926 election.

The emergence of the Swarajist Party as a powerful force in provincial politics caused temporary eclipse of C.Rajagopalachari and his non-cooperation wing of the Congress in 1923. But the resounding success of the Swarajists in the 1926 elections placed them in a peculiar position.
It fell between two stools of Justice Party attack on the one side and the Swarajists unwillingness to accept office on the other. Inside the Legislative Council the Swarajist Party could neither wreck the Government nor undermine the power of the Justice Party. It just became a victim of circumstances! The Swarajist Party chose to support the Independent Dr. Subbarayan Ministry against the no-confidence motion levelled against it by the Justice Party lest it would be replaced in case it was deposed. This decision to support the Ministry was a clear violation of a resolution pressed at the Cauhati Congress of 1926 which asked Congressmen to "refuse to accept Ministrieships or other offices in the gift of the Government and oppose the formation of a Ministry by other parties, until, in the opinion of the Congress or the All India Congress Committee, a satisfactory response is made by the Government to the National Demand". This political expediency of the Madras Swarajists was severely criticised by the Swarajists elsewhere in India as being no more than a perpetuation of the very Dyarchical system that the party was supposed to destroy. The Swarajists contribution to the legislative business of the Reformed Government was, however, creative, constructive, critical and in the best interests of the Presidency.

The Madras Presidency Association: The announcement of Montagu's visit to Madras triggered off communal politics, brought to the fore the underlying communal conflicts and
helped to demarcate the divergent political interests in the Presidency. It divided the Non-brahmins in general and the Non-brahmins within the congress in particular. The Congress Non-brahmins, ardently particular patriotic and nationalistics, were dissatisfied with the parochial goals of the Justice Party. They started thinking in terms of an organisation within the Congress that would seek communal reservation of seats in the forthcoming election of 1920. The result was the birth of the Madras Presidency Association on 20 September, 1917.

The Madras Presidency Association was a single-purpose Association. Its main aim was to secure communal representation to the non-brahmins in all walks of life. Kesava Pillai, the President of the Association, demanded before the Special Madras Provincial Congress session that "the Communities other than brahmins should also be adequately represented in the Legislative Council". After much controversy, the principle of communal representation was accepted by the Madras Provincial Congress Committee for necessary change under the proposed constitutional reforms. Three years later Kesava Pillai suggested that the Madras Presidency Association should work in close collaboration with the Justice Party.

The Council entry issue, however, badly divided the members of the Madras Presidency Association. The prominent members of the Association opposed council entry proposal. Dr. P. Varadarajulu Naidu considered it a "retrogression in
the policy of Congress". E.V.Ramasamy Naicker favoured boycott of not only elections to the Legislative Council but also elections to all municipal and local boards. Thiru Vi. Kalyanasundaram vehemently denounced the Council entry idea and said that it would be "acknowledging our defeat and going into the enemy's camp to surrender".

The Montef Award of 1920 stole the wind out of the sail of the Madras Presidency Association by fulfilling its objective of securing Communal representation and left it without a banner to fight under. Paucity of funds stood in the way of the Association extending the principle of communal representation to other fields. More serious than this were the lack of enthusiasm among the leaders themselves, absence of cohesiveness, the highly individualist attitude of its leaders in assessing political issues of the day, their preoccupation with activities other than those of the Association and absence of common platform which cumulative contributed to its dissolution. P.Kesava Pillai, President of the Association, severed his connection with the Congress and joined the Justice Party. V.O.Chidambaram Pillai (1872-1898) was not very active in the activities of the Association owing to his personal preoccupations elsewhere. Thiru Vi. Kalyanasundaram (1889-1953), deeply committed himself to the labour movement, resigned his editorship of the Association's Tamil Daily 'Desabhaktan' (Patriot) and severed his connection with its activities. Similarly, Dr.P.Varadarajulu Naidu
(1887-1957), one of the elected Secretaries, had to leave
the Association due to his involvement in the Harvey Hill
strike. E.V.Ramasamy Naicker joined forces with C.Raja-
gopalachari in support of non-cooperation Campaign. As a
result of these developments, the Madras Presidency Associa-
tion as an organisation for protecting and promoting the
communal interests of the Non-Brahmins disintegrated.

Madras Presidency Association, by its very nature,
could not play any effective role in reviving and rebuild-
ing the village panchayat system either through legislation
or through voluntary effort. Thiru Vi. Kalyanasundaram, a
devoted worker, powerful writer and persuasive speaker,
however, used to write and speak about the ancient glory
of the panchayat system and the need for reviving it.
While addressing district Congress conferences he exhorted
congressmen to go to villages, organise panchayats and
undertake rural reconstruction work. "It is not enough if
one or two people from the Madras City make a ceremonious
visit to the villages .... mere making of noises in the city
without imparting political education to the villagers
will be of no avail." He wanted Congressmen to work in
the villages to promote self-government instead of invol-
vling themselves in election work. He even suggested
that a Panchayat be constituted for every two villages of
for 5,000 persons; there be a higher body for every 50
panchayats consisting of representatives elected by them;
and in the same way the Taluk, District, Provincial and Central governmental bodies be formed. But neither the Congress, nor the Swaraj Party or the Madras Presidency Association could translate the lofty ideal of Local Self Government into a living reality. It was left to the Justice Party to accept responsibility to run the Government under Dyarchy and giving shape to local government policy as it thought fit!

The Justice Party: The origin of the Justice Party could be traced to the "fear of a Brahmin take over of political power, should Mrs. Besant succeed in her Home Rule endeavours". The Justice Party came into being in the forms of the South Indian Liberal Federation on November 1916. In December, 1916 Sri P. Tyagaraja Chetty issued the Non-Brahmin Manifesto which proclaimed that "The time has come when an attempt should be made to define the attitude of the several important non-Brahmin Indian communities in the Presidency towards that is called 'the Indian Home Rule Movement' ...." The introduction of Montford Reforms in 1919 provided a great Philip to the political proclivities of the Justice Party.

Though the Justice Party was "equally nationalistic in its outlook as the Congress and Home Rule Parties", it remained purely a provincial and communal party throughout.
tion and the original intention of its founding fathers, P.T. Rajams, a leading Justice Party leader, recalled that "It was not the desire of the sponsors, much less of their successors, to exclude Brahmins from Government and public life. In short, it was mainly to push up the backward communities and not to pull down any forward Community". 95

The Justice Party was liberal, non-violent and democratic and hoped to attain its goal gradually through strictly constitutional means. Its objectives were:
1) to promote the educational, social, economic, political and moral progress of all communities in Southern India other than Brahmins; 2) to discuss public questions and make a true and timely representation to Government of the views and interests of the people of South India with the object of safeguarding and promoting the interests of non-Brahmin communities; and 3) to disseminate by public lectures, by distribution of literature and by other means sound and liberal views in regard to public questions and thereby create and direct public opinion. 96 Thus, the overriding aim and ambition of the Justice Party was limited; it was communal in character and confined to counter the Brahmin domination in the political, educational and social life in the Presidency and to use the political infrastructure to achieve this end.

From the beginning the Justice Party had been function-
ing as a provincial party. To start with it was astonishingly free from inter-party infights over the political aims and methods. The Montford proposal to create an electorate which will control the government suited the limited purpose of the Justice Party exceedingly well. The Party welcomed the Reforms not only to share responsibility of running the administration but also to press for communal representation in the governance of the province, particularly in the Legislative Council, educational institutions, civil service and local bodies. As the Dyarchy constitution conferred power on the provincial government in provincial matters, the Justice Party, a provincial party as it was made the most of the Montford Reforms within a view to carry out its cherished goals as well as to consolidate its position in provincial politics.

The Justice Party established its base in the Madras City and started its branches in almost all the district headquarters in the Presidency. The party leaders paid periodical visits to these branches and organised a number of non-Brahmin conferences to explain the political objective of the party. Indeed what gave the Justice Party its strength and sustenance was the tremendous appeal it made to large sections of non-Brahmins. It was this appeal coupled with its moderate views on the Reforms that enabled the party to carry on its effective propaganda against the Home Rule League and the Non-cooperation movement. When
the Montford Reforms were on the anvil and even afterwards the Justice Party had been agitating for separate electorates for the non-Brahmins and for communal representation for them in the services as well as in educational institutions and local bodies. After the Reforms were introduced, though the Justicites failed to get separate electorates as demanded, the Party accepted office and worked the Dyarchy Government with as much cooperation with the British as possible. 97

The rising expectations generated by the Montford Reforms induced many leading non-Brahmins of social standing to flock under the banner of the Justice Party which devoted itself to the promotion of political prospects of non-Brahmins communities in the province. In clear contrast to the Congress the Justice Party promised more than it demanded of its members. "As against the single and non-specific objective of national freedom from alien rule . . . the Madras Party's (Justice Party) objectives were more 'realistic' and related to the interests which would seek and demand expression as soon as the political structure changed to admit native citizens to elected positions of power and influence." 98

It was no wonder that able, influential, well-educated non-Brahmins belonging to well-to-do families rallied round the Justice Party and saw in its non-exacting positive policy and its collaboration with the British power an opportunity to serve the non-Brahmin cause as well as to promote their personal interests!
The Justice Leadership: The Justice Party leadership was urban oriented. Its leaders were all men of means and social standing, well-educated and well-placed, clear-headed about the limited objective of their party and well determined about the direction of their endeavours. Another unique feature of the Justice leadership was that the Party's founding fathers as well as most of those who took charge of running the 'transferred' departments under Dyarchy were experienced in the administration of Municipal Councils and District and Taluk Boards.

Sir P. Thyagaraja Chetty (1862-1925) the founder of the South Indian Liberal Federation ever whose signature the Non-Brahmin manifesto was issued, was one of the first among the non-Brahmins in Madras to take to English education and to participate in public life. He started his public life in local government. He entered Municipal politics in 1882 and served the Madras Municipal Corporation as its President for three years, and as member for over four decades. From civic he moved on to provincial politics when he got elected to the Madras Legislative Council in 1910 from the Municipal Corporation and continued to serve in that capacity till 1925. Though he declined the invitation of the Governor to form the first Justice Ministry under Dyarchy, his very presence in the Chamber gave moral support and political inspiration to his party.
Dr. T.M. Haidr (1868-1919), Co-founder of the South Indian Liberal Federation, was an English educated Medical Doctor. A strong defender of Local Self Government he was profoundly interested in Municipal affairs. His conviction was that education in the mechanisms of local government was the best means to reach the goal of the self-government. As member of the Madras Municipal Corporation, Dr. Haidr waxed eloquent on many abuses in the Madras Municipal administration. He was elected to the legislative Council from the Madras Corporation in 1921. Dr. Haidr was the Editor of his own English Daily 'the Justice' and his writings included 'The Principle and Practice of Local Self-Government and 'Elements of Political Reconstruction'.

A. Subbarayalu Reddiah, who formed the first Justice Ministry was an eminent lawyer in Cuddalore and the Chairman of the Cuddalore Municipal Council. He was the first non-official President nominated to the District Board of South Arcot, and one of the three non-officials nominated as Presidents of District Boards.

Sir K.V. Reddy Naidu (1875-1942) started his career as lawyer and took to public life by becoming member of the Municipal Council of Rajamundry of which he became the Chairman. He was the President of the Taluk Board of Palavara and member of the Godavari District Board (1901 - 1908). He served the First Justice Ministry as Minister for
Development in special charge of Industries. He was the author of "The New Municipal Rules with Questions and Answers in the Madras Legislative Council".108

Sir A.P. Patre (1875-1946), a practising lawyer at Berhampur, began his public life as a member of the Berhampur municipal council (Ganjam District). He was member of the Ganjam District Board which he served for nearly 25 years. He was elected to the Legislative Council from the Ganjam Rural Constituency and on the resignation of A. Subbarayulu Reddiar he was appointed Minister of Education, Public Works and Excise (1921-26) in the first Justice Ministry under Raga of Panagal. From his experience in Local Self-Government he wrote a book on 'Studies in Local Self-Government, Education and Sanitation'.104

B. Munuswami Naidu (1883-1935), a lawyer with lucrative practice throughout his life, started his public career in 1920 as representative of the Chitteer District in the local council. He was the President of the Chitteer District Board from 1922 to 1930 and for sometime Chairman of the Chitteer Municipal Council before he became the Chief Minister of Madras in 1930. The improvement of rural conditions, reconstruction of villages, and enforcement of prohibition engaged his attention. He also wanted that Village Development Funds be constituted.105

It will thus be seen that the founders and the leading
members of the Justice Party were well-versed in local administration. They believed in the educative value of the local self-government which could be an excellent training ground for political aspirants. "In India, for all practical purposes", said Dr. T.M. V. Nair "if we must have Self-Government, we must be trained for it. We must acquire the capacity, develop our qualities in that respect and then start on Self-Government." The Justicites were keen on remodeling the Local Self-Government on the lines suggested by the Decentralisation Commission. "The Decentralisation Commission have laid down correct lines, on which local bodies in this country ought to be evolved in the future. Any departure from these lines in future legislation regarding these bodies will spell failure." With all the advantages of a limited objective, well-knit party organisation, support of the ruling power and leadership trained in the art of Local Self-Government the Justice Party was in a unique position to work out the Dyarchy experiment and place local government on a firm foundation.

**THE DYARCHY MINISTRIES.**

**FIRST JUSTICE MINISTRY:**

The elections of 1920 for the Madras Legislative Council were held under extraordinary circumstances. They were held when the entire nation was in the grip of Gandhi's non-Cooperation Movement. In the Madras Presidency as elsewhere
the Congress including the Swarajists boycotted the elections in 1920. But the Justiciés found in them an opportunity to make a mark and move in the direction of their party objective. Prominent Justiciés like P. Thyagaraja Chetty, K.V. Reddy Naidu and others had done effective election campaigning throughout the Presidency. The absence of any effective opposition coupled with energetic electioneering enabled the Justice Party to register an enviable victory in the election. It won 63 out of 98 elected seats as noted elsewhere.

Lord Willington, the Madras Governor, though he could have nominated any three of the Justice Members in the Council as ministers, called upon Sir P. Thyagaraja Chetty, the leader of the Justice Party, to form the Ministry, in accordance with the British Parliamentary practice. Though he could not accept the offer he suggested the following three leading Justiciés for the post instead:

1) A. Subbarayulu Reddiar, 2) P. Ramarayasingar and 3) K.V. Reddi Naidu. The Governor, therefore, appointed A. Subbarayulu Reddiar as the Chief Minister in December 1920 in charge of Education portfolio, P. Ramarayasingar, in charge of Local Self-Government and K.V. Reddi Naidu in charge of Development. But in April, 1921 when A. Subbarayulu Reddiar resigned his post on grounds of ill-health, he was replaced as Education Minister by A.P. Patro. P. Ramarayasingar took over the duties of the Chief Minister.
SECOND JUSTICE MINISTRY:

The Swaraj Party contested the 1923 Council elections and won 11 seats. The entry of the Swaraj Party into the election fray weakened the election prospects of the Justice Party. It made a dent on the dominant position of the Justice Party which was able to win only 44 seats as compared with 63 in 1920. With its strength reduced in the Council, the Justice Party managed to maintain its majority in the Legislative Council with the support of the 17 additional Justice Party members appointed by the Government of Madras.\textsuperscript{114}

The second Justice Ministry was formed by P. Ramarayanaswami, the Raja of Panagal along with A.P. Patro and T.N. Sivagnanam Pillai.\textsuperscript{115}

INDEPENDENT MINISTRY:

The limited appeal of the Justice Party, the intra-party infights and the pointed opposition of the Swaraj Party substantially weakened the position of the Justice Party in Madras politics after 1923. K.V. Reddy Naidu warned that "This time it is an occasion for searching of hearts for devising means to save the declining fortunes of an honourable party, struggling for existence and threatened with extinction."\textsuperscript{116} The result was that in the third election of 1926 the Justice Party lost its lead to the Swaraj Party which won 41 seats. The Justice Party mustered only 22 seats as against 44 in 1923. Strangely enough, the Independents
pocketed 36 seats! As the Swaraj Party, the majority party in the Legislative Council, refused to form the Ministry, Dr. P. Subbarayan, an erstwhile member of the Justice Party but now elected as an Independent, had agreed to form an Independent Ministry along with two other Independents viz. A. Ranganatha Mudaliar and R.N. Arkiiaswami Mudaliar.

THIRD JUSTICE MINISTRY:

Much had happened during the intervening years between the third and fourth elections. The Justice Party now reduced to a position of a minority opposition in the Legislative Council moved a motion of no-confidence against Dr. P. Subbarayan's Independent ministry but the motion was defeated with the support of the Swaraj Party. However, differences over the question of co-operating with the Indian Statutory Commission in 1927 led to the resignation of the two Independent Ministers. These vacancies were filled by S. Mathiah Mudaliar and M.R. Sethurathnam Iyer. The Subbarayan Ministry survived with the full support of the Justice Party. Then in the elections held in November, 1929 the Justice Party easily won a majority of seats, the Swaraj Party having desisted from contesting the election. Again the Justice Ministry was formed by Chitteer B. Maniswamy Naidu with Sir P. T. Rajan and P. Kumaraswamy Reddiar in 1930.

Since B. Maniswamy Naidu lost the confidence of the Justice Party in his leadership, he was succeeded by Rao
Swetaehalapathy Ramakrishna Ranga Rao, Raja of Bobbili as party leader and hence the Chief Minister in 1952 and P.T. Rajan and P. Ramaswamy Reddiar continued to be the other two ministers.\textsuperscript{121}

\textbf{FOURTH JUSTICE MINISTRY:}

On the eve of the 1954 general elections, the Congress lifted the ban on the Council entry\textsuperscript{122} and the Congress contested the election. The Justice Party was decisively defeated by the Congress. But the Congress did not accept office. Hence the Raja of Bobbili formed in the Justice Ministry once again and the Ministry continued till 1 April, 1957.

\textbf{INTERIM JUSTICE MINISTRY:}

In the meantime the Government of India Act, 1955\textsuperscript{123} was passed and the Act envisaged autonomy for the provinces. The elections under the new constitution were held in the Province in 1957. Thanks to the vigorous elections/conducted by S. Satyanarayana and Jawaharlal Nehru who toured the districts of the Madras State the Indian National Congress secured 159 seats out of 215 in the Legislative Assembly and 26 out of 46 seats in the Legislative Council. The Justice Party was routed and it was able to get only 21 seats! The emergence of the People's Party and the Madras Provincial Scheduled Castes Party and the revival of the Provincial Branch of the
Muslim League helped only to split the anti-Congress Vote.\textsuperscript{124} Though the Congress Party secured an overwhelming majority of votes, it refused to accept office without securing assurances against the interference in the day to day administration by the Governor. Hence an Interim Ministry was formed under K. V. Reddy Naidu.\textsuperscript{126} But when the Congress Party was satisfied with the assurances given by the viceroy on the basis of the statement of the Secretary of States for India it accepted office in the first half of July, 1957 and formed a Ministry under C. Rajagopalachari. Even this Ministry was short-lived. When the second World War broke out in September, 1939 the Congress having decided not to participate in the war, C. Rajagopalachari's Ministry resigned in October. The Madras Government was then carried on by the Governor with the aid of Civilian Advisers.\textsuperscript{128}

\textbf{STABLE MINISTRIES:}

Thus during the entire Dyarchy period stable popular Ministries remained in office,\textsuperscript{129} despite consistent Congress non-cooperation and Swarajist non-formation of Ministry even when they won majority of seats in the Council, and run the administration of 'transferred' subjects successfully. As a result, certain healthy parliamentary conventions were formed and followed in the Province. For instance, the practice of inviting the leader of the majority party to form the Ministry came to stay. The hoary British convention of ministerial responsibility to the Legislature and collective
responsibility in the Cabinet came to be followed. The members, including the Swarajists respected the decisions of the Council and owed common loyalty to it irrespective of party affiliation. Under the Dyarchy, the legislature consisting of elected members came to be divided into Ministerial Party and Official Opposition with policies and programmes of their own. In the words of P.T.Rajan, "a self-appointed whip" of the Justice Party, the Madras Legislative Council was functioning as "a miniature House of Commons". In short, "Madras worked Dyarchy successfully while in the rest of British India that mode of quasi-self-government failed completely" and several unusual factors contributed towards this achievement. 

It is significant that many of the Council members were persons, especially the members of the Justice Party, were experienced in Municipal and Local boards administration. Their interest and experience in this field stood them in good stead in introducing important legislation in the field of local self-government. The Madras Panchayats Act was passed in 1920. Similarly a separate Madras Local Boards Act was passed in the same year and amended in 1930 and 1955. The Taluk Boards were abolished in 1934. Besides, a number of other steps, such as the Conference of Local and Municipal Officials and non-officials (1920), Constitution of a Financial Relations Committee by the Government to consider ways and means of improving the finances of the local bodies
(1920), appointment of a Government Committee to investigate into the feasibility of making the village Panchayats as the basis of local administration (1928), the appointment of a Special Officer to investigate into the financial conditions of the local bodies (1932) etc, were taken during the Dyarchy period. Another significant development of this period was the political linkage between the parties in the Provincial Legislature and those in the local boards which led to several far-reaching consequences.
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