CHAPTER IV

THE FIRST CONGRESS MINISTRY AFTER THE WAR

In 1946, General Elections to the Madras Legislative Assembly were held under the Government of India Act of 1935. The Congress emerged victorious in the elections but the choice of the leader posed a problem.¹

In view of the developments between 1942 and 1945 most of the Congressmen believed that the future of Rajaji was sealed once for all. It was apparent that most of the Congress leaders continued to be hostile towards those who did not follow the policy of the Congress in 1942. But Gandhi viewed the situation from a different angle.² He perhaps thought in terms of forging unity among all the nationalists against the British and suggested the restoration of Rajaji to his old position.³ Apart from suggesting to the AICCWC the

¹ G. Rudrayya Chowdari, op. cit., p. 155.
² Ibid.
³ Ibid., 156
name of Rajaji, Gandhi also tried to dissuade Pattabhi Sitaramayya and Prakasam from contesting for the leadership of the Madras Assembly. He advised Pattabhi not to enter the Parliamentary field on the plea that his services were required for a better purpose. Similarly he indirectly suggested to Prakasam that for people like him constructive work would be better.

The internal rivalries among the provincial Congress leaders enabled Gandhi to make a final attempt to restore Rajaji to leadership in the Legislature. While on his way back from Madras Gandhi openly

4 Andhra Patrika, 12 October, 1945.

5 "Like the TNCC., the APCC was also ridden with group politics. In the Madras Provincial politics the Andhra group politics also played its role. The two rival groups that carried on a battle royal were the Pattabhi group consisting of Gopala Reddy, Sanjeeva Reddy and Kala Venkat Rao and Prakasam group consisting of Thennetti Viswanatham, N.G. Ranga, A. Kaleeswara Rao and Bulusu Sambamoorthi. Pattabhi was considered to be Gandhi’s man and was loyal to the High Command. Prakasam was independent and assertive in party politics. Sometimes he even used to resent the High Command’s interference in provincial party politics." Government and Politics in A.P. p.73.
declared that he would prefer Rajaji to be leader to anybody else in the Province.6

Some of the Andhra leaders tried to bring Pattabhi to the forefront.7 Even while in prison, Kala Venkata Rao had started negotiations with other PCC, leaders of the Presidency in order to make Pattabhi the Chief Minister. Followers of Pattabhi also made representations to the All-India leadership to select Pattabhi as the leader. But Gandhi’s assertion put an end to Pattabhi’s desires.

It was under these circumstances that the selection of the Leader was about to be done. The party meeting was scheduled for 7 April 1946.8 Kala Venkat Rao and B. Gopala Reddi who visited Bombay and Delhi to canvass in favour of Pattabhi succeeded in persuading the High Command to direct the leaders of

6 Harijan, op. cit., 10 February 1946; "Gandhi stated that he was not interested in Parliamentary work but that he expressed his choice when he was challenged. However, his subsequent interference in the leadership election and his insistence on the selection of Rajaji makes one doubt whether Gandhi’s statement was correct."

7 Ibid., p.163.

8 MLAD, Vol.IV, p.34.
the Congress Party of the Province to postpone the above meeting.9

Consequently, Prakasam, Madhava Menon and Kamaraj, the Presidents of the Andhra Pradesh, Kerala and Tamilnadu Congress Committees were summoned by telegram to Delhi for consultations.10

At Delhi, in the discussions held between Gandhi, Azad, Patel and the Madras leaders, the discussion centred round the candidature of Rajaji and Pattabhi. Gandhi advised Prakasam to withdraw from the contest.11 On 10 April, Gandhi, sent for Kamaraj and Madhava Menon in particular and talked to them at length.12 They made it clear that they could not accept Rajaji as their leader.13

9 Though Pattabhi denied that the postponement was made not because of Gopala Reddi and Venkata Rao, it was clear from Gopala Reddy’s letter to Rajaji that they met Gandhi and Patel and was responsible for the events. - G. Rudrayya Chowdari, op. cit., p.176.

10 Ibid., p.164.


Azad, Gandhi, and Patel were of the view that the old Congress Ministry which functioned between 1937 and 1939 under Rajaji should be returned as far as possible as in the case of the other provinces. Their belief was that bribery and inefficiency could be brought under control only if Rajaji assumed office. Before his meeting with the leaders of the Province, Azad had sent a telegram asking the members to elect Rajaji as leader and also stated in the telegram that it was agreeable to Gandhi and Patel. At the same time he was careful to add that the above recommendation was only advisory and not mandatory.

Though Prakasam was eliminated by the High Command, Rajaji was not agreeable to Kamaraj’s group the third candidate agreeable to the High Command and Kamaraj was not acceptable to Prakasam. Kamaraj met Rajaji and sought his help in electing Pattabhi, as his chances of becoming Premier were bright. But Rajaji refused to support him. Consequently Pattabhi withdrew allowing others to contest.

15 Ibid.,
The MLCP met on the 18 April 1946 at Madras to consider the suggestion of the High Command. V.V. Giri was elected chairman of the meeting. An appeal was issued to the members of the MLCP to wholeheartedly accept the advice of the High command in accepting Rajaji's leadership. However, when the proposal was put to vote the vote went against Rajaji's leadership. Thus the meeting established beyond doubt the strong opposition that existed to Rajaji becoming Premier.

V.V. Giri, the chairman, after adjourning the meeting to 19 April, communicated the result of the meeting to the High Command. The All-India leadership made another unsuccessful attempt and 'advised' the Legislature Party to send a panel of names from which it would select one. One 19 April, the question of selection of a panel for leadership was placed before the party and was rejected.

17 The Hindu, 19 April, 1946.
18 Ibid.
19 Ibid.
20 The Hindu, 20 April, 1946.
21 Ibid. 21 April, 1946.
By this time a controversy arose with regard to a Press report in which Gandhi was reported to have stated that the MLCP was free to elect any leader it liked and that he had no objection to Prakasam or anybody else being elected. S.B. Adityan, a Congress member, on the basis of this reference requested Gandhi to allow the MLCP to have free choice in electing its leader. Gandhi denied the above Press statement and informed through the press that he had said nothing of the kind to anybody and that he had written a personal letter to Prakasam, which the latter was at liberty to publish. Talks among the members of the MLCP indicated that in the event of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad insisting upon the submission of a panel of names for the selection of a leader, the names of Prakasam and Muthuranga Mudaliar were likely choices of the Party. V.V. Giri would step in only in case Prakasam declined.

22 The Liberator, 21 April, 1946.

23 The Hindu, 20 April 1946; Sardar Vallabhai Patel’s Correspondence, Vol. III, p. 10.

"Prakasam states in his Autobiography that as a consequence of his attitude during the ‘Pro-change’-No change controversy Gandhi developed some hostility towards him. It is however difficult to say what extent Gandhi was against Prakasam. Further it is unfair to attribute any motives other than the considerations of national interest to the leaders of Gandhi’s stature. Prakasam would never become a member of the Working Committee except once when S. Srinivasa Iyengar, a friend of Prakasam became the President of the Congress in 1926."
to contest the election.  

Finally the Legislature Party was allowed to elect its own leader.  

Till that moment all the leaders, in Madras except the followers of Rajaji acted unitedly and opposed the suggestion of the High command. During all this controversy the Andhra group headed by Gopala Reddy, Venkata Rao, and Pallam Raju constantly resisted any attempt to bring in Rajaji. Also, they prevailed upon the Kamaraj group to set up a candidate for leadership against Prakasam.

Since both the High Command and the Andhra Group opposed Prakasam’s leadership, Kamaraj decided to put up Muthuranga Mudaliar for the leadership of the Assembly. Thus Prakasam and Muthuranga Mudaliar were the contestants for the leadership. Everyone thought that having known Gandhi’s views regarding Prakasam, Rajaji’s group would support Muthuranga Mudaliar. But that was not to be when the election took place on 23 April 1946. K. R. Karant from Karanataka proposed the


25 The Liberator, 22 April, 1946; The Hindu, 23 April, 1946.
name of Prakasam and Kamaraj, proposed the name of Mathuranga Mudaliar. Twenty nine members of Rajaji’s group remained neutral. Prakasam was elected by 82 votes to 69 polled by Muthuranga Mudaliar.26

Prakasam sought the advice of Patel regarding the formation of the ministry who informed Prakasam that no more reference should be made to the High Command.27 Then Prakasam submitted a list of the names of his ministers as desired by the Governor on 29 April, 1946. The Proclamation under Section 93, was revoked on 30 April, 1946. Prakasam and nine of his colleagues were sworn in on the same day.

No former minister of Rajaji’s cabinet could find a berth in Prakasam’s ministry, which was contrary to the Congress policy in other provinces. This was the first complaint against the Ministry received from B. Gopal Reddy by Patel on 2 May, 1946.28 To the above complaint of Gopal Reddy, Patel wrote that while other provinces had accepted the advice of the

28 Ibid., p.24.
High Command, Madras Province alone rejected the proposal and hence he had decided to wait for sometime and see how they intended to maintain their relation with the central organisation. So, he refused to either advise or interfere in the affairs of this Province for sometime. He felt that the MLCP had done great injury to the Congress organisation as a whole and set up a bad precedent for which they would in future repent.\(^{29}\)

When the nominations to the Upper House were announced by the Governor of Madras, the Madras nominations contained the names which were unlikely to be recommended by a Congress Ministry.\(^{30}\) Patel questioned Prakasam whether the nominations were made by the Governor disregarding the advice of the Ministry. The prevailing prejudice against Prakasam, made Patel to feel that Prakasam had brought discredit over this matter between Patel and V.V. Giri on the

\(^{29}\) Sardar Patel's Correspondence, Vol.III, p.25.

\(^{30}\) Ibid., pp.22-24, "I do not understand why Title holders have been nominated nor do I understand why, if my information is correct, a gentleman who was removed from the Servants of India Society for defalcation is accepted as Congress nominee. There is a lady who has been nominated about whom I have heared complaints which require consideration."
to the Congress organisation. The correspondence one hand and Patel and Prakasam on the other reveals the fact that Prakasam was teased by the High Command.

In the meantime the organisational election of the Tamilnadu PCC had become overdue. Rajaji’s group wanted to avenge Kamaraj for having prevented Rajaji’s re-election as Premier. On May 16, 1946 the election of the President of the TNCC took place. Those who did not belong to either group felt that if they chose a candidate who belonged to the anti-Rajaji group there was a possibility of that candidate defeating Kamaraj. Rajaji chose Sa. Ganesan of Karaikkudi to oppose Kamaraj. Kamaraj won the Presidential election by 152 votes against 90 secured by Sa. Ganesan. This was the sixth year of office for Kamaraj as the TNCC President.

The majority of the members elected to the TNCC also belonged to Kamaraj group. After the Presidential

---

31 Sardar Patel’s Correspondence, Vol.III., p.27.
32 Ibid., pp.27-30.
34 The Hindu, 17 May, 1946.
election about 70 members out of 192 did not take part in the TNCC organisational elections and this enabled Kamaraj to fill the vacancies with his own men. 35

Meanwhile, in the election to the office of the Speaker, Thennetti Viswantham, a Telugu Brahmin, was favoured by Prakasam and P. Sivashanmugam, a Tamil Scheduled Caste member was supported by Kamaraj. Sivashanmugam gave a shock treatment to Prakasam, by his 109 to 69 victory over Thennetti Viswanatham. 36

When the Madras Congress Legislature Party met on 12 July 1946 to elect forty-five members to the Constituent Assembly, a discussion on the list of names followed. 37 Some Members criticised the list on the ground that it had been prepared on the basis of communal considerations and that it did not contain

35 The Hindu, 18 May, 1946.

36 Madras Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol.I, p.17 Prakasam avenged his defeat in the APCC. election by defeating Pallam Raju a candidate of the Pattabhi group in the APCC Presidentship election.

37 Ibid.
names of genuine workers and constitutional experts.\textsuperscript{38} As the non-Brahmin sentiment was gathering strength, the High Command felt that some intellectuals including Rajaji would not find a place. Hence, they sent a list of eleven names to be elected and all of them were Brahmins. (1) Rajaji (2) Pattabhi Sitaramaiah (3) Alladi Krishnaswami Iyer (4) N. Gopalasamy Iyengar (5) K. Santanam (6) B. Shiva Rao (7) Kamala Devi (8) Mrs. Ammu Swaminathan (9) Anantasayanam Iyengar (10) Kesava Rao and (11) Prakasam were the names proposed by the High Command. When the nomination was announced, Viduthalai wondered whether there were no non-Brahmin experts worth the name available to be nominated by the High Command.\textsuperscript{39}

After the controversies receded to the background the Premier initiated the Khadi and village Industries Programme. The High Command took no interest in the affairs of the Madras Ministry and the non-cooperation was entirely due to Prakasam's

\textsuperscript{38} \textit{MLAD.}, Vol.II., p.45. Prakasam wanted to make peace with opposing groups. Hence he entrusted the work of selecting candidates for Constituent Assembly to Rajaji which resulted in dissatisfying some members who had voted for him.

\textsuperscript{39} \textit{Viduthalai}, 24 July, 1946.
deliberate refusal to be guided by the Congress High Command. From the time he assumed office as Premier, the Congress High Command neither received any report on the working of his Ministry nor was it interested in anything that happened in the Madras Presidency.\textsuperscript{40} This situation continued up to September 1946.

In September there were reports that about 100 MLAs had sent a petition to the Congress High Command demanding dismissal of the Ministry and appointing of a ministry which had the support of the people.\textsuperscript{41} It was believed that Kamaraj and Gopal Reddy had collected signatures from a hundred members of whom 42 were from the Andhra region.\textsuperscript{42} Prakasam's Ministry was criticised for its bias against non-Brahmins and for attempting to curb the labour movement.\textsuperscript{43}

Prakasam who wanted to make peace with opposing groups even went to the extent of entrusting the work

\textsuperscript{40} Sardar Patel's Correspondence, Vol.V, Letter from Prakasam to Nehru dated 27 August 1946.

\textsuperscript{41} Viduthalai, 21 September, 1946.

\textsuperscript{42} Ibid., 2 October, 1946.

\textsuperscript{43} Ibid.
of selecting candidates for the Constituent Assembly to Rajaji which gave dissatisfaction to many. Yet the first shot against Prakasam's ministry was fired by Rajaji group. As the Premier of the first Congress Government of 1937 Rajaji introduced the Prohibition in Salem district in the first instance and latter on extended it to four districts. After 1939, the Adviser's Government continued it for sometime but later it set aside Prohibition in all the districts.

When Prakasam assumed office he felt that to start with it would be good to enforce Prohibition in the four districts in which Rajaji originally introduced it. Rajaji and his followers openly criticised the Government for not introducing Prohibition throughout the state. In the Legislature Party meeting it was pointed out that the policy or even the preparation of the Budget must have been done with the previous consent of the Party. Prakasam explained the constitutional position to the agitated members and did his best to convince them. The members

44 AICC File No. P.B. 7/1947-48, NMML.
45 The Hindu, 31 May, 1946.
did not accept this and insisted that in all the twenty-four districts of the Presidency Prohibition ought to have been introduced. By way of compromise Prakasam agreed to introduce it in eight districts in the first stage.

Prakasam’s initiation of legislation -- relating to Zamindari Abolition, the constitution of Producer cum-Consumers’ Co-operative Societies in certain districts of the Province where black-marketeering of food grains and of other necessities of life were rampant, the formation of food committees in each and every village of the Province -- invited stiff opposition from mercantile and capitalist classes.46

The Khadi Scheme of Prakasam earned strong opposition by many sections. From the very moment he assumed charge as the Premier of Madras in 1946, Prakasam concentrated on solving the problem of food and clothing. He suggested that through Khadi the clothing shortage could be solved.47 On 1 October 1946

46 AICC File No. P.B 7/1947-48, NMML.

Prakasam announced the New Khadi Scheme. He clearly indicated that to create the proper atmosphere for the development of Khadi, his Government would not allow the establishment of any new textile mill in the Province. He also stated that his Government would surrender the additional spindles allotted to the Province by the Central Government as a part of post-war development schemes.

The TNCC, and its President Kamaraj opposed the New Textile Policy of Prakasam. Soon after its announcement, the TNCWC expressed its opposition to the scheme in its meeting at Coimbatore on 6 September, 1946 and stated "... that it was premature to adopt such a policy in the Province alone without being able to assess what the effects of the new Khadi policy of the Government would be and ... that such a step at this stage would affect the economic development of this Province." Kamaraj in a letter addressed to Prakasam stated that the MLCP should be urgently

48 Madras Information, 5, October, 1946; The Hindu, 6 October, 1946.

49 Ibid.

50 The Hindu, 8 October, 1946.
summoned to discuss the New Textile Policy of the Government before it was implemented.\textsuperscript{51}

Kamaraj demanded the suspension of the Khadi scheme till it was discussed at the MLCP meeting.\textsuperscript{52} But his stand was criticised on the ground that Khadi was an integral part of the declared policy of the Congress and in such case there need be no special meeting of the Congress Legislature Party. While Prakasam was strenuously attempting to implement the Khadi scheme inspite of severe opposition from many quarters, the Government of India permitted Private Companies to import machines for textile mills. The Tamil newspapers welcomed the Government of India's announcement and commended their plan for the expansion of the textile industry in India. It was hoped that the Madras Government would accept the Centre's decision and drop the proposal for the abolition of textile mills.\textsuperscript{53}

\textsuperscript{51} \textit{Ibid.}, 12 October, 1946.

\textsuperscript{52} G. Rudrayya Chowdari, \textit{op. cit.}, p.116.

\textsuperscript{53} \textit{Swatantra}, 19 October, 1946.
The Central Government which was also run by the Congress party advised the Madras Presidency Government not to object to the installation of the already sanctioned spindles. Despite so much of opposition from different quarters and advice from the Centre Prakasam stood firm and refused to yield.

The Textile Protection Conference organised by the mill owners on 11 November, 1946 met at Madras to pass resolutions against the anti-mill policy of the Government. Prakasam in defence of his Textile Policy issued a statement on 13 November, 1946. In a lengthy statement again on 18 November, 1946 he answered various criticisms.

54
MLAD, 7 November, 1946

55
The Liberator, 13 November, 1946.

"The Conference passed resolutions pointing the economic deterioration, enslavement of the province industrially and economically to other provinces, requesting the Government to conduct general election on this issue, pointing how this policy would be injurious to handloom industry which received 19000 bales of yarn out of the supply of 64,000 bales, requested the government to start new mills and appointing Textile Protection Committee with some leading men."

56
The Liberator, 19 November, 1946.
Legislators from various groups happened to meet at Delhi in connection with the work of the Constituent Assembly. All these men had ample opportunities of contacting Rajaji and the High Command and they together found the time propitious to muster their strength against Prakasam. By the end of January all groups were ready with their plans.\(^57\) The Madras Legislature commenced its session on 30 January, 1947. Throughout the period from 30 January to 14 February 1947 Prakasam found it difficult to get the approval of the Party for several policies and programmes. Though the anti-Prakasam move began from the date of his Premiership, it took final shape only after the appointment of Bigni Venkatratnam as Minister in the place of Bigni Veerasamy who resigned.\(^58\) The Andhra Group which was expecting the place to be given to one of them, was disappointed when the Premier did not even consult them. The Kamaraj group joined them and both made approaches to the Rajaji group. Even before the appointment of Venkatratnam, Dr. Rajan was negotiating with the Premier for the appointment of two Ministers


\(^{58}\) AICC File No. C.774/1946.
from the Rajaji group including himself. The Premier was stated to have asked him to wait till the Budget session was over, which enraged the Rajaji group.59

While the Congress leaders and the vested interests in the Presidency were so persistent in their opposition to Prakasam the High Command did not come to his rescue. The High Command's attitude enabled Prakasam's opponents to think in terms of a No-Confidence Motion.60 A requisition signed by 30 members of the MLCP to convene a special meeting of the party to discuss the No-Confidence Motion against the leadership of Prakasam, was handed over to him on 12 February, 1947 at his residence by Annamalai Pillai, R.V. Swaminathan, C.K. Govindan Nair and M. Venkataraju representing the Rajaji, Kamaraj groups and Kerala and Andhra regions.61 The requisition contained:

"We, the undersigned members of the Congress Legislature Party desire to move the following resolution in the first instance for that purpose on Sunday the 16 February at the Government Home Building as pen clause 15 of the Madras Congress Legislature Party.

59 AICC., File No.C.774/1946.

60 The Liberator, 12 February, 1947.

This Madras Congress Legislature Party hereby resolve that it has ceased to have any confidence in the leadership of Prakasam”.

Prakasam told the requisitionists that he would give them a reply after he returned from Delhi to where he was leaving the next morning.

Under the signatures of Kamaraj, Kaleeswara Rao, Madhava Menon and Rajan the following telegram was subsequently sent to Patel and Azad:

"Have delivered Mr. T. Prakasan—Requisition for meeting to express no confidence in him as leader - 110 out of 196 members of Legislature Congress Party have signed supporting motion."62

When Prakasam was at Delhi, Kala Venkata Rao, and Dr. TSS Rajan also arrived there to have consultation with the Congress High Command in connection with the Ministerial crisis.63 While he was at Delhi, Prakasam was instructed by Patel to convene the Madras Legislature Congress Party meeting64


Prakasam instead of realising the gravity of the situation argued that there was no provision for a no-confidence motion in the leader's whose tenure of office was only a year. He ruled out the motion of no confidence against him.

Rajaji requested Patel to send a telegram to Prakasam instructing him to convene the Madras Legislature Congress Party meeting. Patel accordingly sent a letter in which he required Prakasam to convene the Madras Legislature Congress Party meeting.65

On the 19 February 1947, Prakasam announced that the meeting would be held on 25 February to consider the no confidence motion.

Prakasam tried to manouvre this meeting in his favour. Instead of arranging the meeting to test his strength, he converted the meeting 'to enquire into such matters such as whether there had been a group system functioning inside the party and if so what had been the activities of various groups'.66


agenda it was stated that Prakasam was the Chairman, Thennetti Viswanatham, his associate as Secretary and the Three Presidents of TNCC, APCC, KPCC and the Secretary of the South Canara DCC as the Committee Members.

The Committee was (1) to investigate into the truth about the existence of group system in the CLP.

(2) to investigate into the formation and the cause for the formation of such group if any

(3) to investigate into the activities of each group on a local basis for the furtherance of its own objects or its political opinion

(4) to ascertain whether the group system had been in any way responsible for the internal conflicts and dissensions and

(5) to advise remedies if any to put an end to the group system and to create the necessary atmosphere for making the administration smooth and harmonious.67

Kamaraj declined to be a member of the above Committee and he expressed the view that under the

existing circumstances, the sub-committee idea would be interpreted as an attempt to coerce the members who had signed the no confidence motion against him.\textsuperscript{68} AICC President deputed S.R. Deo from Delhi to be present on the 28th.\textsuperscript{69} Prakasam in the meanwhile addressed public meetings in which he stressed that the public alone had the responsibility to question him and not the Congress President J.B. Kripalani.\textsuperscript{70}

When the meeting commenced on the appointed date Prakasam disallowed the motion of no-confidence, on a point of order holding that there was no provision to question the leader alone. He maintained that the no-confidence motion should be against the Ministry as a whole.\textsuperscript{71}

Then the no-confidence motion against Prakasam was passed unanimously in his presence under the

\textsuperscript{68} \textit{The Liberator}, 27 February, 1947.

\textsuperscript{69} \textit{Viduthalai}, 25 February, 1947.

\textsuperscript{70} \textit{Ibid}.

\textsuperscript{71} \textit{The Liberator}, 3 March, 1947.
chairmanship of O.P.R was declared by Prakasam illegal and he dissolved the meeting.\textsuperscript{72}

However, Prakasam tendered his resignation to the Governor on 14 March 1947. Meanwhile brisk canvassing was going on for the Premiership. While Dr. Rajan was the choice of Rajaji’s group, the Kamaraj group put up Bakthavatsalam as their candidate. The Andhras sponsored Gopal Reddy.\textsuperscript{73} It was also suggested that Rajaji should be the Leader and Premier without portfolio. There was also a strong feeling that Prakasam would himself contest for the leadership at the meeting to be held on 21 March, 1947.\textsuperscript{74}

On 21 March, 1947, the Madras Legislature Congress Party meeting was held in the presence of J.B. Kripalani, the AICC President. The candidates of Rajaji and Kamaraj withdrew from the contest to facilitate the defeat of Prakasam. Hence the contest

\textsuperscript{72} \textit{Viduthalai}, 18 February, 1947.

\textsuperscript{73} \textit{The Liberator} 14 March, 1947; \textit{Viduthalai} 15 arch, 1947; \textit{F.R. Home}, Pol., p.4-5, 24 March, 1947.

\textsuperscript{74} \textit{Ibid.}
was between Prakasam and O.P.R. In the voting for the election of a new leader O.P.R. secured 116 votes against 73 for Prakasam and got elected to the post of Premier.75

Viduthalai, 21 March, 1947 and 22 March, 1947; The Liberator, 22 March, 1947. "Mr. O.P.R. and his colleagues even with the best of intentions can do something for us probably they will be forced by Vaidyanatha Iyer to harm the non-Brahmins."