CHAPTER VII

THE RAJAJI MINISTRY AND AFTER (1952-54)

The total number of seats in the Madras Legislative Assembly before 1952 was 214. As per the Representation of Peoples Act, 1951, revised the number of seats stood at 375. And in the 1952 First General Election the following was the Madras Legislative Assembly result:

Assembly Election of 1952

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Seats won</th>
<th>Total votes polled</th>
<th>Percentage secured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congress</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>33,36,054</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communist</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9,09,022</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.S.P.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10,88,173</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.M.K. (Not contested)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>39,41,967</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>92,75,216</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The Hindu, 12 February, 1952.
In the 1952 Elections, except Perumalsami Reddiar and Sitarama Reddy all the nine Ministers in the Kumarasamy Raja cabinet, contested. However, five Ministers Gopala Reddy, Bakthavatsalam, Kala Venkat Rao, Chandra Mauli and Madhava Menon and the Chief Minister Kumarasamy Raja, were defeated. A.B. Shetty, Roche Victoria and B. Parameswaran were the three ministers who won in the elections.\textsuperscript{2} The Congress strength in the 375 member Legislative Assembly was 152, i.e. 32 short of an absolute majority. The election results thus indicated a difficult situation for the Congress.

Immediately after the results were announced, Kamaraj declared that the Congress would serve the people as an Opposition party. Apparently the Congress did not show any enthusiasm for obtaining power.

The Opposition parties attempted an alliance to form the Ministry. They had no common ideology or principle but they tried to muster strength under the leadership of the Communists. The Communists advocated the formation of a ‘United Front’. Through manipulations formation of the United Democratic Front was

\textsuperscript{2} Dravidanadu, 27 January, 1952.
achieved. A Steering Committee was appointed with nineteen members of different parties which was to evolve a common programme stated to be a minimum programme on which they would agree. Prakasam was appointed the Chairman of the Steering Committee.

The Steering Committee met on 12 February 1952 and passed the following resolution:

"Taking note of the will of the people as expressed in the Elections to the Legislature of the State, this convention of the Legislators belonging to Communist Party, Kisan Mazdoor Praja Party, the Forward Bloc, the Independent Party and other Independents and the Justice Party hereby resolve to unite into a democratic coalition which shall be called 'The United Democratic Front' in order to strive to get the support of the majority of the legislators to this Front with a view to translate the will of the people into practice and to form a Government".

M.A. Manickavelu, the Leader of the Commonweal Party with five other members of his party decided not to take part in the deliberations of the United Democratic Front's Conventions. The minimum programme


4 Ibid.

5 Ibid.
of the United Democratic Front was not acceptable to him. He criticised that the minimum programme was not practicable.\(^6\)

Like Manickavelu, the Independents also did not like to continue in the United Democratic Front.\(^7\) V.V. Ramasamy of Virudhunagar, a former Justicite, and some others including P.T. Rajan belonging to the independent group resolved to have a new party under the name of the 'Independent Progressive Party'. Thus difference of opinion prevailed among the members of the United Democratic Front. When the Congress came to know the differences that existed among the members of the United Democratic Front, they decided to form the ministry and revitalise the party. Kamaraj, offered to resign from the office of the TNCC President, if by doing so the Congress Party could be revitalised and made to function more effectively. Kamaraj also suggested that the Congress Committee at the district and taluk levels should be dissolved.\(^8\)


\(^7\) The Liberator, 15 February, 1952.

\(^8\) The Mail, 17 February, 1952; The Hindu, 18 February, 1952.
When the Congress in Madras was in a mood to form the ministry the Congress High Command summoned Congress leaders from Madras for discussing the possibilities of forming the Government in the State.\(^9\) Kamaraj stated after his return from Delhi, that no decision with regard to Ministry-making and choice of the leader of the party was arrived at, and that it was largely a matter to be considered locally.\(^{10}\)

If the Congress agreed to form the ministry, Rajaji’s supporters and admirers felt that Rajaji would be the best choice for the Chief Ministership. Rajaji, who voluntarily retired from the Central Cabinet on health grounds, was, at that time, taking rest at Courtallam.\(^{11}\) Rajaji’s supporters wanted him to be at Madras for consultation and hence he rushed to Madras. The Congress members of the Madras Legislature Party met on 29 March, 1952. Kumarasamy Raja, the outgoing Chief Minister, requested C. Subramaniam, a close lieutenant of Rajaji, to move a resolution with a hope

\(^{9}\) The Mail, 11 March, 1952.

\(^{10}\) Ibid.

\(^{11}\) The Mail, 27 March, 1952; The Hindu, 30 March, 1952.
that if a request was made unanimously, Rajaji might not refuse to consider their request. Accordingly the following resolution was moved by Subramaniam.

"The Madras Legislature Congress Party is strongly of the opinion that in the present political situation in the State the services of an eminent statesman like Mr. C. Rajagopalachari are needed and therefore requests Mr C. Rajagopalachari to take over the leadership of the Congress Party in the Madras State Legislature."

For the implementation of the above resolution a nine member committee consisting of Kumarasamy Raja, Kamaraj, Sanjeeva Reddy, Mrs. A.V. Kuttimalu Amma (wife of Madhava Menon of Kerala), A.B. Shetty, C. Subramaniam, V.C. Palanisamy Gounder, S.B.P. Pattabhi Ram Rao and Mrs Soundram Ramachandran was constituted.

All members of the committee except Kamaraj met Rajaji at his residence and requested him to accept the office. Rajaji expressed his inability to take up office on grounds of ill-health but told the deputationists that they might consult the Congress President Nehru and decide the future course of action.

The deputationists sent a request to Nehru setting out in detail the developments and requesting

him to use his good offices to persuade Rajaji to take up the leadership of the party at that critical hour. Subramaniam and Soundram Ramachandran were deputed to meet Nehru and appraise him of the situation.

After meeting Nehru, the deputationists, returned with two letters one to Kumarasamy Raja and the other to Rajaji. Nehru stated that having regard to Rajaji’s age and state of health he would hesitate to interfere with his rest and would therefore leave it to the party to act as they considered best. Rajaji, wanted time to take a decision on the question of accepting the leadership of the party. When this was brought to the notice of Kamaraj, he along with Sanjeeva Reddy, met Rajaji. It was reported that Rajaji stipulated a condition for his acceptance that Kamaraj should step down from his Presidential chair. To overcome the crisis Kamaraj readily agreed to it but he informed through Kumarasamy Raja that Rajaji should become a member of the Legislative Assembly after becoming Chief Minister. The election of the leader was to take place on 31 March, 1952. Rajaji asked for time upto 6 p.m. on 31 March to give his final reply in view of the latest developments.

On 31 March 1952 all the elected members assembled and the meeting was fixed to commence at 6 p.m. Suspense mounted since Kumarasamy Raja who had gone to Rajaji’s residence to get the final reply of Rajaji had not arrived even after 6-15 P.M.. At about 6.20 P.M. Kumarasamy Raja arrived with the acceptance letter of Rajaji to lead the party. Proposed by Kamaraj and seconded by N. Sanjeeva Reddi and supported by Mrs. A.V. Kuttimalu Amma and A.B. Shetty the Presidents of the Kerala and Karnataka Pradesh Congress Committees respectively. Rajaji was thus unanimously elected leader of the Congress Legislature Party. 14

Kumarasamy Raja, as Chairman of the Madras Legislature Congress Party, sent a communication to the Governor conveying the news of the election of the new leader. The Governor Sri Prakasa sprang a surprise by nominating Rajaji to the Legislative Council under Article 171(1) (e) of the Indian Constitution. The nomination of the Rajaji to the Council and the Governor’s action to call him to form the ministry raised an uproar among the Opposition members. It was described by Opposition parties as ‘Kollaippura Vazhi’

14 The Mail, 31 March, 1952; The Hindu, 2 April, 1952.
(Entry through backdoors). P. Ramamoorthy, the leader of the Communist Party remarked that the nomination of Rajaji to the Madras Legislative Council by the Governor was an insult to the democratic consciousness of the people of Madras.\textsuperscript{15} The United Democratic Front members were highly disappointed over the action of the Governor for allowing the Congress to assume power and also for appointing Rajaji to the Council.

On 1st April 1952 Rajaji was sworn in as the Chief Minister.\textsuperscript{16} When there was criticism for having called the Congress to form the Ministry, the Governor pointed out that no single party in the Madras Assembly had an absolute majority. He had to call upon the person who in his judgment was most likely to command a stable majority in the Legislature to form the ministry. It was further stated by him that as the Congress Party was the largest single party in the Assembly he had invited its leader Rajaji to form the Government. The Leader of the Communist Party P. Ramamoorthy unsuccessfully challenged the action of the Governor both in the High Court and in the Supreme Court.

\textsuperscript{15} \textit{The Hindu} 2 April 1952.

\textsuperscript{16} \textit{The Mail}, 1 April, 1952.
When the 15 member Ministry of Rajaji was sworn in, it included M.A. Manickavelu, the leader of the Commonweal Party. The Congress Party, in its search for enough legislative support to form a Cabinet, persuaded the six Commonweal Party members to support it so as to form the government, but it could not persuade them to join the Congress.

When Rajaji was invited to take the reins of leadership and form the Ministry, high hopes were entertained regarding his ability to explore new avenues of political action. The list of Ministers submitted belied the hopes of those who expected Rajaji to appoint persons from the other groups. Rajaji’s action was deplored on the ground that he deliberately avoided giving representation to opinions other than the ones held by his group.\(^{17}\)

Rajaji’s assumption of power was followed by Kamaraj giving up the leadership of the TNCC. Subbarayan was unanimously elected as the President of the TNCC as requested by Rajaji.\(^{18}\) After the election

\(^{17}\) Interview with A.N. Rajan, Sarvodaya Worker on 11 April, 1980.

\(^{18}\) The Hindu, 1 May, 1952.
of the TNCC President, Rajaji requested both Kamaraj and Kumarasamy Raja to offer their help to him.\textsuperscript{19}

Immediately after Rajaji became the Chief Minister a bye election was caused in Aruppukottai Constituency in Ramnad District by the resignation of U. Muthuramalinga Thevar as a Member of Parliament. Rajaji, highly confident of his popularity, felt that success for his party in this election would prove that the people had faith in his ministry. But contrary to his expectations the Congress candidate was defeated by the Opposition candidate.\textsuperscript{20}

Kamaraj, who had resigned from the Presidentship of the TNCC earlier to facilitate Subbaroyan, now decided to regain the Presidentship of the TNCC.\textsuperscript{21} But Rajaji's preferences lay elsewhere and he suggested Bakthavatsalam for the Presidentship. Having obliged once already, Kamaraj ignored the suggestion and announced his decision to contest for the

\textsuperscript{19} \textit{The Hindu}, 2 May, 1952.

\textsuperscript{20} \textit{The Hindu}, 22 June, 1952.

\textsuperscript{21} \textit{Ibid.}, 28 June, 1952.
Later, Kamaraj was proposed by Bakthavatsalam and was unanimously elected as the President of the TNCC. This was possible because of the hold Kamaraj had over the organisation.

In this situation the announcement of the formation of a separate Andhra Pradesh gave rise to speculations among Congressmen in Tamilnadu that the Rajaji Ministry might be replaced. This was because of the growing discontent among Congressmen against Rajaji. Rajaji was opposed to the policy of giving five acres of land from the Government for Congressmen who had made sacrifices during the struggle for freedom. Sanjeevi Reddy in a political conference openly criticised Rajaji for this peevish attitude. He declared that while some persons were rewarded with high offices like Governor, Governor General, and Minister there was nothing wrong in the part of the Government granting five acres of land to the poor freedom fighters.

---

22 T.S. Chockalingam, op. cit., pp.52-53

23 The Hindu, 27 December, 1952.

24 Ibid., 26 March, 1953.

25 Dravidanadu, 31 May, 1953.
Moreover the Opposition was gaining strength against Rajaji over his introduction of the New Elementary Education Scheme. Earlier, Rajaji, rather abruptly, announced a New Elementary Education Scheme. The Scheme was announced on April 16, 1953 by a circular of the Director of Public Instruction of the composite state of Madras.²⁶

Basically the ideological aspects of the New Education Scheme of Rajaji had its origins in the proposals for educational reforms advocated by Congress during the freedom movement. Gandhi sought emancipation in productive work in his Basic Education Scheme. Rajaji’s scheme was an improvisation over Gandhi’s. It has accepted the principle of minimising the role of classroom teaching in children’s education.

Rajaji as Premier in 1937 had suggested to R.M. Statham the then Director of Public Instruction to implement a scheme of half a day schooling and half day family apprenticeship. Statham thought that the scheme was impractical, since firstly half a day school was not popular as was indicated by the low attendance on Saturdays and secondly there was unemployment and underemployment among the parents of the children.

²⁶ The Hindu, 18 April, 1953.
Statham, however introduced the scheme in Periakulam Taluk in Madurai on a voluntary basis, the parents being given the option to register for half a day school or full day school. Not one parent opted for the half a day school.

When India attained Independence Gandhi's Basic Education was the only available ideological alternative to the existing system of primary education. It was hoped that it would make primary education self-supporting, which would make it possible to spread primary education without straining the financial resources of the State. But these hopes were belied. Basic Education was not only, not self-supporting but was very costly. Thus in only about 600 primary schools out of 38,000 in Madras State there was Basic Education.

When Rajaji assumed power in 1952 a double shift system was already in force in many urban primary and secondary schools where rush for admission was great. This system of four hour shifts had been introduced as an emergency measure during the Chief Ministership of OPR. But each shift had a separate set of teachers. The same building was used for the two shifts. The children were free after school hours. Rajaji thought
it would be easier to extend what was already in force, and proposed half-a day schooling and a half-a day family apprenticeship for primary schools in rural areas.  

The details of Rajaji’s New Education Scheme were as follows:

I. The scheme is applicable only to non-basic primary schools in rural areas. Basic schools and primary schools in urban areas are not covered by the scheme.

II. The school hours of each batch of pupils in the primary school will be reduced to three hours a day. The working days may be extended to six days a week if necessary.

III. Every class will be divided into two batches, one batch will work for three hours in the morning and the other for three hours in the evening.

IV. The same teacher will handle both batches.

V. The pupils will have (Classroom) work in school for 20 to 24 periods per week as against 35 periods in force previously.

"I do not like the alternative of cutting up the day into two halves. The School as well as the family occupation as should have the benefit of mornings as well as afternoons. The farmer boys and girls ought to go to school on three full days and get the benefit of it and be with the parents and cattle in the field of family workship during four full days." — Speeches of C. Rajagopalachari, Governor General of India, Government of India Publication, 1950, pp.257-259.
VI. There will be no lowering of standards in languages, elementary mathematics, history and geography, hygiene, civics and moral instruction. The same number of periods will be provided for each of the subjects and the same syllabus will be followed.

VII. The other half of the day when the pupils will not be at school will be spent by them helping their parents in their occupation if the parents belonged to occupational classes.

VIII. The pupils who do not belong to occupational classes will be attached to a farmer or craftsmen in the village for learning a trade. Such pupils will for all purposes work like apprentices under the craftsman. There will be no supervision by any school teacher. The craftsman will be the craft teacher and will be required to maintain an attendance register indicating that the pupils were present during the allotted time.

IX. Pupils may be organised to render social services to the village in all possible ways.

X. Where there are no local craftsman, it is necessary to induce one from outside to come and settle in the village in the vicinity of the school. Since he will require a place to serve as his work-spot, a craft shed may be erected within the premises of the school if the school has a large compound.

XI. It is estimated that such special arrangements of craft education may be required by not more than 5 to 10 pupils of non occupational classes.

XII. A village school council consisting of willing and capable persons may be constituted in each village to help arrange craft training.

XIII. The scheme shall come into effect from the school year 1953-54 commencing in June 1953.
Thus the New Education Scheme of Rajaji was nothing but the introduction of the shift system in schools to facilitate more children to get admission. But the scheme provided only three hours of schooling and another three hours of apprenticeship in crafts. Though it was a proposal combining manual training of a pre-vocational character with formal academic education it was termed ‘Kulakkalvi’ (vocational education) because the children were expected to receive vocational training from their parents who would have been traditionally engaged in a specific profession.

This scheme of Rajaji was opposed both by Educationalists and politicians. Rajaji refused to rescind the scheme. He was firm in his decision to implement it inspite of all the opposition. A special General Body meeting of the Madras Chamber of District Boards held at Madras passed a resolution against implementing it unanimously.28

At the Ambasamudram Taluk Elementary School Teacher’s Conference, the Madras District 43rd Educational Conference, the Ramnad District Educational Conference and the Madras State Headmasters’ Conference

28 The Hindu, 15 June, 1953.
resolutions were passed requesting the Government to drop the scheme.\footnote{29}{The Hindu, 15 June, 1953.} Even the Pro-Rajaji English Daily. \textit{The Hindu} through a Cartoon expressed its disapproval of the scheme.\footnote{30}{The cartoon was titled - THE PLUNGE - In the cartoon C.R. was asked by the parent: "Is he safe? There is not enough water" Water denoted village handicrafts.} O.P.R. criticised Rajaji for this Scheme and warned that there might be agitations against the Scheme.\footnote{31}{Nam Nadu, 19 June, 1953.} But a stubborn Rajaji would not sense the strong opposition gaining momentum against his policy.

In opposing the New Scheme, both the Dravidar Kazhagam and the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam played a major role. The Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam observed 21 June, 1953 as an Anti-New Elementary Education Scheme Day, and it took processions and launched signature campaigns against the scheme.\footnote{32}{Ibid.} Further the Executive Committee of the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam which met on 13th July, 1953 resolved to start agitations against
the New Scheme by picketing in front of Rajaji's house from 14 July, 1953.

The Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam's opposition to the New Scheme arose because of its conviction that the New Elementary Education Scheme was a clever device to perpetuate 'Varnashrama Dharma', which would strike at the very root of the social and political progress of the backward classes.33 C.N. Annadurai the DMK leader even suggested at the public meetings that the Chief Minister should either drop it or resign.34 Never before was Rajaji criticised by the D.K. men with such vehemence as now. In this situation, though Congressmen opposed the Scheme they were not prepared to come out openly and criticise the attitude of Rajaji, and lent only moral support to the agitation. When the Motion for the introduction of the NEES was introduced the opposition succeeded in having the Scheme referred to an Expert Committee by a majority vote.

The opposition members felt that they had defeated the Government. Thennetti Viswanatham of 33 Nan Nadu, 13 July, 1953.

34 Ibid.
Prakasam group raised a point of order in the Assembly on 31 July, 1953 in which he stated that under the spirit and terms of the Constitution the Government could not continue in office and must tender its resignation.\textsuperscript{35}

The formation of a separate Andhra Pradesh again raised the question as to whether Rajaji would be allowed to continue as the Leader of the Congress Legislature Party in the residuary Madras State.\textsuperscript{36} Great interest was evinced in this matter all over the State especially in non-Congress circles since many non-Congressmen were associate members of the party. As such it was considered that the Leadership of the MLCP could not be a matter concerning the Congress Party alone. Hence Rajaji decided to convene a meeting of the Congress Legislature Party belonging to the residuary state in the third week of September and seek its decision on his continuance as its leader. Considerable political activity was expected to follow from that time onwards. Kamaraj admitted that he had suggested to the Chief Minister that a meeting of the

\textsuperscript{35} \textit{The Hindu}, 1 August, 1953.

\textsuperscript{36} \textit{The Mail}, 6 September, 1953.
Congress Legislature Party of the residuary Madras State be summoned to consider the question whether the leadership of the Party should be changed consequent on the reorganization of the State.\textsuperscript{37} But Rajaji did not convene the meeting of the MLCP.

A memorandum with the signature of some 40 members of the Legislative Assembly was sent by P. Varadarajulu Naidu to Nehru.\textsuperscript{38} The reaction of Rajaji to this representation came in the form of an appeal to the people not to get angry towards the persons who opposed him but to examine why they opposed him. He emphasized at public meetings that he would not quit office merely at the behest of certain people.\textsuperscript{39} When there was a move to oust Rajaji by his political opponents, pro-Rajaji men passed resolutions deprecating it.\textsuperscript{40}

\textsuperscript{37} \textit{The Mail}, 7 September, 1953.

\textsuperscript{38} Ibid., 1 November, 1953; \textit{The Hindu}, 2 November, 1953.

\textsuperscript{39} \textit{The Hindu}, 2 November, 1953.

\textsuperscript{40} Ibid.
The following Press statement issued by Nehru, the Congress President, deplored the move against Rajaji.

"I have seen a statement in some newspapers to the effect that Dr. P. varadarajulu Nayudu had sent me through Sri Kamaraj Nadar, President, Tamilnadu Congress Committee a document containing the signatures of a number of members of the Madras Legislature Congress Party. This document it is stated expresses want of confidence in the leader Mr. C.R.

I was surprised to read this item of news, because I know nothing about it and no such document has been given to me or sent to the AICC Office. Any attempt to carry on a campaign of this kind and in particular sending such news for publication in the Press are highly improper.

Any move to express 'no confidence' in the leader of the Congress Party Mr. C.R. in the legislature, is to be deprecated as this could only result in harm to the Party, to the Congress, to the State of Madras."41

The Parliamentary Board was also of the opinion that Rajaji, who had accepted the burden of that high office only at the unanimous request of all those concerned two years ago, should be asked to continue in that office in the interest of the State of Madras.

41 The Mail, 7 December, 1953; The Hindu, 8 December, 1953.
The President of the TNCC, Kamaraj promised full cooperation to Rajaji.\textsuperscript{42}

In the beginning of the year 1954 there were rumours that Rajaji was anxious to relinquish office as Chief Minister. And the rumours started gaining validity during the month of March when Rajaji stayed away from the sittings of the legislature owing to indisposition. There was also talk about Rajaji communicating with the Congress President Nehru regarding his wish to retire from active politics and his waiting for his approval. But Rajaji denied this in a statement made in the Assembly.\textsuperscript{43}

Rajaji subsequently changed his mind and conveyed to the Legislature Party on 26 March 1954, his decision to resign his office as the Leader of the Party and as Chief Minister and it was announced that the Party would meet on March 30 to consider his resignation, the election of his successor and other arrangements.\textsuperscript{44}

\textsuperscript{42} The Mail, 7 December, 1953; The Hindu, 8, December, 1953.

\textsuperscript{43} The Mail, 13 December, 1953.

\textsuperscript{44} Ibid.
Before the meeting of the Legislature Congress Party was held, Kamaraj and Rajaji met and came to an agreement. Rajaji's suggestion that there need be no election of the new leader till the Budget Session was over and that one of the ministers could act as Chief Minister for one or two months was accepted by Kamaraj. On 26 March when Rajaji proposed C.Subramaniam his follower for Chief Ministership, he did not mention that this agreement was to last for two months only and that the election of a new leader would take place afterwards. As Rajaji did not state the arrangement was temporary Kamaraj had to explain that he had agreed to the above arrangements to avoid any controversy during the Budget Session. On account of this, the meeting wanted the election of the leader to be held. Rajaji agreed to this but fixed March 30, just five days away as the date for election and insisted on it despite protests from members that there was not sufficient notice.

The four days that intervened before the election witnessed feverish activity among Congressmen. It was a difficult task to choose the leader. There

45 Indian Express, 3 April, 6 April and 7 April, 1954.
was only one person, in the Rajaji’s Ministry, A.B. Shetty by name, who was acceptable to the anti-Rajaji group. But as the Rajaji’s group had decided on Subramaniam, Shetty did not want to embarrass them. The Kamaraj group insisted on Kamaraj being elected leader. Kamaraj had not either accepted or denied this suggestion until 3 p.m., a few hours before the meeting. Hence, Rajaji’s group assumed that Subramanian would have a walkover. They were flabbergasted when they came to know at 6 p.m that Kamaraj intended to contest.

On march 30 when the meeting began, Subramaniam pleaded for the postponement of the meeting to which Kamaraj did not agree pointing out that the Congress High Command was opposed to any further postponement. The meeting was attended by 134 members. P. Varadarajulu Nayudu who had all along made representations against Rajaji proposed the name of Kamaraj which was seconded by Annamalai Pillai. Bakthavasalam who was an ardent supporter of Kamaraj in the 1940s now proposed the name of Subramaniam and it was seconded by U. Krishna Rao. Kamaraj secured 93 votes as against the 41 by C. Subramaniam.46

46 Indian Express, 3 April, 6 April and 7 April, 1954.
As the new leader of the MLCP Kamaraj wrote to Nehru about the election. Then, during the first week of April, 1954 when Kamaraj was at Delhi his suggestion that he would function as the nominal head of the party, while someone else could be the Chief Minister, was not accepted by the High Command.\textsuperscript{47} The High Command stated that the leader of the party always should be the Chief Minister and that if he did not like to be the Chief Minister the party should elect somebody else who would be so.\textsuperscript{48} Kamaraj returned to Madras to consult his friends. Kamaraj’s men expressed the view that another election for the party leader would create unnecessary complications and that Kamaraj should himself become the Chief Minister. Thereupon Kamaraj wanted an assurance from them. "If I become Chief Minister you must not come and tell me that this man or that man should be a Minister." Everyone agreed and Kamaraj set about forming the Ministry. The election of Kamaraj as Leader of the MLCP brought to an end a period of suspense and speculation following Rajaji’s decision to relinquish leadership.

\textsuperscript{47} \textit{The Mail}, 3 April, 6 April, 1954.

\textsuperscript{48} \textit{Indian Express}, 7 April, 1954.
The Governor accepted the resignation of Rajaji and his colleagues with effect from the forenoon of Tuesday, April 13, 1954 and the swearing-in of the new ministry took place on April 14, 1954 the Tamil New Years Day.49

Kamaraj who became the Chief Minister was not a Member of either the Assembly or Council but was an elected Member of the Lok Sabha. On June 22, 1954 a bye-election to the Assembly became a necessity as a result of the election of A.J. Arunachalam from the Gudiyatham Assembly Constitutency being held void by the Election tribunal. Kamaraj decided to contest the bye-election. Strangely enough Kamaraj was supported both by the DK and DMK parties for the reason that he was a non-Brahmin. E.V. Ramasamy Periyar contended that Kamaraj would be the first Tamilian to occupy the Chief Minister’s chair since 1924. He considered Rajaji, Prakasam, O.P.R. and Kumarasamy Raja as non-Tamils though they lived in the Tamil speaking part of Tamilnadu.50 The non-inclusion of Brahmins in Kamaraj’s

49 The Mail, 14 April, 1954.

50 Rajaji and Prakasam were Tamil speaking and Telugu Speaking Brahmins. Though O.P.R. and Kumarasamy Raja were non-Brahmins, they were Telugu speaking non-Brahmins. Though they were also sons of the soil, because of their culture and language they were not considered Tamilians by D.K. Men.
Cabinet, was very much appreciated by the Dravidar Kazhagam.

When the election results came out it was a landslide win for Kamaraj. He was declared elected by over a majority of 38,000 votes over his only rival, a Communist. In this election Kamaraj secured more votes than his predecessor in this constituency. The election of Kamaraj as Chief Minister was a turning point in the political history of Tamilnadu for after a long period of political uncertainty, Tamil Nadu was to have a stable Government. He was the first Chief Minister who occupied that office continuously for a decade in Tamilnadu. His rise to power put an end to group politics and factional fighting for the ten years during which he held the reins of the Government. All through these ten years he was constantly supported by the Dravidar Kazhagam and hailed as 'Pachai Tamilar'. (a true son of the soil).
CONCLUSION

The Indian National Congress, which was the first all India association, ushered in a new epoch in the political life of India and it gave shape to the political programme of India. It promoted the idea of nationhood among the people. Gandhi involved all sections of the population rich, poor, educated, illiterate, urban and rural, in short all the classes and masses in the struggle for freedom. The Congress under his leadership had grown into a powerful organisation, experienced both in agitational and electoral techniques and was firmly established as the nation’s dominant party.

The Indian National Congress had to motivate the vast masses scattered in rural areas also. To achieve this objective, regional bodies based on linguistic criteria had to be set up by the National Congress. The aims and objectives of the Congress had to be made known to the people through the regional languages. This necessitated the creation of the regional Committees of the Congress Party. As the Congress grew decentralization of the organization became a necessity.
Before Independence, the Madras Presidency Congress, a branch of the Indian National Congress was operating and functioning in the Madras Presidency. For the four linguistic areas of Madras Presidency, Tamil, Telugu, Kannada and Malayalam, there was only one Provincial Congress Committee before 1921, and it was divided into four sub groups viz. the Tamilnadu, Andhra, Kerala and Karnataka Provincial Congress Committees. The Tamilnadu Congress functioned as a separate unit as far as the organisation was concerned, but for the legislative and executive functions Madras Presidency was a single unit consisting of all the above mentioned linguistic sub-groups as well.

When Gandhi, launched the Non-Co-operation Movement, a group of Congressmen supported the Movement. The moderates among the Congressmen were against Non-Co-operation. However at a meeting of the Tamilnadu Congress, held in Tirunelveli in June, 1920 Rajaji, managed to have the resolution on Non-Co-operation passed by the Committee. Kasturi Ranga Iyengar and Srinivasa Iyengar were opposed to Non-Co-operation and preferred Council Entry. This appears to have been the starting point in the factional and internal conflict of the Tamilnadu Congress.
Though in the struggle for freedom, both groups were united on almost all other political issues they were opposed to each others in general. This was seen in the election of the President of the Committee year after year. After the exit of Srinivasa Iyengar, it turned out to be a conflict between Rajaji and Satyamoorthy in the 1930s as the later was the ardent supporter and disciple of Srinivasa Iyengar.

Rajaji managed to become the Premier of Madras Presidency overriding the claims of Satyamoorthy in 1937. During the Second World War Rajaji and Gandhi held divergent views and Rajaji’s political isolation followed. Those who were politically opposed to Rajaji, took the opportunity to criticise him openly for his endeavour to help the British in the war efforts.

Against the backdrop of war-time developments, the Tamilnadu Congress Presidential election was conducted in 1940. Kamaraj the disciple of Satyamoorthy, (a candidate sponsored by Satyamoorthy) emerged victorious in the Tamilnadu Congress Presidential election against the candidate sponsored by Rajaji. After the death of Satyamoorthy his group
was led by Kamaraj while the other group continued under the leadership of Rajaji.

After the failure of the Cripps Mission, the political situation in India deteriorated. The most important change was Rajaji's attempt to enter into an understanding with the Muslims and trying to restore popular government in the provinces governed by the Congress earlier. Rajaji brought a resolution in the Madras Legislature Congress Party recommending to the AICC, the Muslim League's demand for separation from a united India and that the League might be invited for arriving at an agreement for securing the installation of a National Government to meet the national emergency. Critics of Rajaji felt that Rajaji had done disservice to the country. Rajaji faced severe criticism not only at the national level but was also the target of political invective in Tamilnadu.

Rajaji spoke on all platforms expressing his views. This was viewed by many as defiance by Rajaji against the party. Disciplinary action against Rajaji was advocated for deviating from the stand of the party. But Rajaji stuck to his point. The TNCC decided to take disciplinary action against him. The TNCC's threat of disciplinary action was followed by
Rajaji’s resignation both from the Legislative Assembly and from the Congress in 1942. During the Quit India Movement while the other Congress leaders were in jail, and when the Congress organisation was banned, Rajaji alone remained as a silent spectator of events passing in quick succession.

After the end of the war in 1945 when the political situation began to change Rajaji mobilised support for re-entry into the Congress and assumption of leadership of the Congress. Rajaji succeeded in getting himself elected as a member of the Provincial Congress Committee by a resolution passed by the Tiruchengode Taluk Congress Committee, a branch organisation of the TNCC. The TNCC Working Committee under the Chairmanship of Kamaraj set aside the election of Rajaji as it was against the rules. But he had to welcome his re-entry into the Congress as his reentry was supported by the Congress High Command. The Congress organisational wings discussed this problem of Rajaji’s reentry and a Tamilnadu Congress Workers’ Conference was held at Tirupparankundram in Madurai District to settle the issue.

The High Command deputed Asaf Ali to amicably settle the differences that had arisen in the Tamilnadu
Congress ranks. Asaf Ali held consultations and discussions with various groups and declared that the election of Rajaji to the PCC was valid until it was set aside by a duly constituted election tribunal. The verdict was thus in favour of Rajaji. As the election was nearing the Parliamentary Board was constituted for selecting candidates to contest in the forthcoming 1946 elections. On this issue also a settlement was reached.

During the visit of Gandhi in 1946, his pungent remarks about opposition to Rajaji was viewed as a veiled attack on Kamaraj. Kamaraj resigned from the Parliamentary Board. In the 1946 election the Congress emerged victorious and the choice of the leader of the Assembly posed a problem. Even though Rajaji's name was proposed by the Congress High Command the local organisations did not accept him. Finally, Prakasam, a candidate not supported by the High Command was elected as the Leader of the MLCP.

Prakasam occupied the post of the Premier hardly for a year. During his tenure of one year he had to face stiff opposition from many quarters. In the election for the post of Premier held in 1947 Prakasam was defeated by O.P. Ramasamy Reddiar.
In the next year also he contested and lost to him again. Rajaji had become the Governor of Bengal in 1947-48, Governor-General in 1948-1950, and subsequently Minister without Portfolio and Home Minister at the Centre in 1950-51 and was out of Tamilnadu politics. Nevertheless, his group was very much active in Tamilnadu.

O.P. Ramasamy Reddiar got the support of Kamaraj, Rajaji and Pattabhi for the second term of office. However, in the face of internal opposition he decided not to contest for the third term. After O.P. Ramasamy Reddiar, P.S. Kumarasamy Raja, a candidate sponsored by Kamaraj became the Chief Minister.

Prakasam who could not become the Premier brought allegations against some of the Ministers of O.P. Ramasamy Reddiar Ministry and sought the High Command's intervention. The Congress High Command deputed Shanker Rao Deo to inquire into it. Prakasam was not satisfied with the enquiry and finally quit the Congress organisation.

In 1952 as per the newly enacted Representation of People's Act, 1951 the first General Elections took place. In this election the Congress failed to secure an absolute majority. The opposition under the
leadership of Prakasam formed the United Democratic Front and mustered strength for forming the ministry.

To tide over the crisis Rajaji was brought back to shoulder the responsibility. Rajaji continued to be the Chief Minister for two years. As a result of strong opposition to his New Elementary Education Policy he had to resign and Kamaraj succeeded him as the Chief Minister. In the removal of Rajaji as in the case of earlier Chief Ministers, groupism in the Congress was a main factor.

The assumption of power by Kamaraj as Chief Minister in 1954 put an end to groupism both in government and organisation for a decade. The formation of Andhra Pradesh and the establishment of a new party called the Swatantra Party by Rajaji resulted in the extinction of strong opposition to Kamaraj inside the Congress party.

In the Tamilnadu Congress Party factions were widely prevalent. Under Rajaji or Kamaraj factions reflected the socio-economic group interest. In the factional conflicts ideological and non-ideological, linguistic and regional and communal considerations had had a hand.
No party in India has been beyond the pull of factions. The factions indeed are found in Indian political arena. The task facing the Congress Party in the period from 1946 to 1956 was integrating divergent regional and caste interests within a geographically vast and multi-linguistic Madras Presidency while at the same time keeping the Socialists and Communists out of office.

The Congress itself was a reflection of this diversity and the Congress Legislature Party often became the arena for factional conflicts as in the organisation itself. The Ministerial instability during the period from 1946 to 1954 was due to the antagonism between non-Brahmin, Brahmin interests, the Tamil-Andhra conflict and the old animosity between radical and moderate nationalists.

Groupism within the Congress was one significant feature in the organisation and working of the party. The Congress factions were sensitive, volatile, unstable and hierarchical. The unstable nature of the factions could be seen at the time of elections and ministry making. Factions functioned both in the legislature and in the organisation.
The pluralist character of the Congress party was the main source of factionalism. Three factors viz. personality, power, and patronage promoted factionalism in the Tamilnadu Congress Party. Factions were formed and dissolved on the basis of personal loyalties towards the respective group leader. Loyalty is the outcome of the patronage extended to the party members by their respected leader. The patronage flowing from the political power wielded by its leader was responsible in creating factions within the party.

Leaders like Rajaji and Kamaraj could command the personal loyalty of large number of Congressmen. The impact of the factional fight could be seen during and after the election of the party leader from 1930 onwards. Intense factional activity was always seen during the election time. And again regional factors were responsible for the factionalism within the Congress.

Factions were often found to draw inspiration from outside agencies also. To cap it all the Congress High Command, (the national leaders of the Indian National Congress) itself was a source of factionalism. There were pro-High Command and anti-High Command factions.
The following effects were noticed as a result of factionalism in the Congress. (a) It weakened the organisation. (b) It totally paralysed the organisational work of the party. (c) Factions within the party promoted caste and class rivalries. (d) Factional politics affected not merely the party concerned but had wider repercussions. (e) It invariably led to agitational politics. (f) A faction which lost a battle in the party bitterly fought outside the party. (g) Such bitter factional policies produced several violent agitations in the State. One by one within a short span of five years three Ministries were dislodged (h) Finally, the non-Congress opposition parties were virtually overshadowed as the Congress functioned both as the ruling and opposition party.

Another notable feature of the factionalism of the early fifties was the desertion of the party by certain leaders who founded regional parties. Prakasam and his group's resignation resulted in the birth of the Praja Party. Subsequently when the Kisan Mazdoor Praja Party was formed in June 1951, the Praja Party in Andhra joined the Kisan Mazdoor Praja Party. Prof. Ranga, a prominent member of the Praja Party demanded the retention of some individuality for the Praja Party
even after joining Kisan Mazdoor Praja Party. He soon disassociated himself from Prakasam and formed the Krishikar Lok Party with himself as its Chairman in 1951.

In a way the factionalism that created a regional party prevented the members of the party from joining with the opposite forces. This enabled them at a later stage to merge with the parent body.

Muthuramalinga Thevar's 'Forward Bloc', T.G.Krishna Moorthy's 'Reformist Congress', P.S.Chinnadurai's and others' 'Socialist Parties' and Rajaji's 'Swatantra Party' are instances in point. The 'Khadi' wearing Congressmen who were originally in the Congress moved away from it grouping themselves as various parties and contested elections in 1952 and made certain that the Congress did not get an absolute majority.

From a closer study of the period, it becomes clear that the Congress organisation in Tamilnadu evolved into an effective political party from its origin as a mass movement against British rule. Factions arose in the villages leading to mutual recriminations.
The sum total of such activities was the deterioration in the morale of the people and the sense of depression which it produced in the minds of constructive workers. In this study one finds even men of great character and integrity becoming victims of circumstances and resorting to short cuts and questionable means in their pursuit of political power. Their swerving from the path of righteousness and morality is noticed. On most occasions expediency rather than considerations of ideology appeared to have weighed with them.

In the infighting and group alignment within the Congress Party the two key figures were Rajaji and Kamaraj. Rajaji an influential, capable and shrewd leader was challenged by an equally powerful and able leader Kamaraj. In the struggle for political power the latter outwitted the former first by relieving him of the Chief Ministership of the Madras State and then contriving his exit from the Congress Party.

In this inner-party conflict can be seen the full play of forces of communalism and class consciousness. As seen in the foregoing pages these considerations have had their beginning long before the country achieved independence.
The practice of luring persons by offering positions in government and to make them defect from one party to join another made its definite appearance during this period. Given the prevailing political trends among the politicians the groups or factions did persist and weakened the Congress in Tamilnadu and paved the way for the rise to power of the D.M.K. in 1967.