CHAPTER - V

NON-COOPERATION AND KHILAFAT

MOVEMENTS IN MADRAS CITY

The Congress launched the Non-Cooperation Movement in 1920 to achieve Swaraj. Thinking that if Indian cooperation ceased, the British Raj would collapse, the Congress mobilized the masses to Non-cooperate with the British Raj. Though the Congress attracted support from a broad spectrum of the people of Madras Presidency through its various programmes, it failed to achieve its declared object of Swaraj at that time.

The decision of the Indian National Congress to embark on Non-Cooperation resulted partially from the impetus supplied by the Muslim based Khilafat Movement¹ and partially by the Jallianwallabagh massacre, which affected in equal degree both the Hindus and Muslims.

¹ In order to get the support of Indian Muslims, the British Government in the beginning of the first world was promised that no harm could be done to the Turkish Kingdom and the Muslim sacred places. But these sacred places were ruined and the Turkish Empire was dismembered. The religious states of the Sultan of Turkey, who was divested. The apprehended Indian Muslims formed a Khilafat Committee under the leadership of Maulana Azad and demanded for the continuance of the Khalif’s control over Arabia and the Holy Places of Islam (G.O.No. 716, Pub. 17 Nov. 1920; G.O.No.686, Pub., 2 Aug. 1920; Desabhaktan, 10 June 1920)
Having total faith in the declared aim of Britain and her allies that they were fighting to make the world safe for democracy, during the First World War, India responded to the call of the British Empire.

After the war, Mont-Ford Reform Act of 1919 was passed, which was unsatisfactory to the Indians. Further, it was preceded by Rowlatt Act which was enacted on 21st March 1919 amidst the united opposition of all the Indian members of the Legislative Council, the Congress, press and the public. Its enactment evoked much opposition and condemnation. Immediately, the MPCC held a meeting and constituted an Anti-Rowlatt Committee with S. Kasturi Ranga Iyengar, C. Vijayaraghavachari, A. Rangaswami Iyengar, V.O. Chidambaram Pillai, Subramania Siva, T.V. Kalyana Sundara Mudaliar, C. Rajagopalachari, S. Satyamurti, T.V. Venkatarama Iyer, T.S.S. Rajan and T. Prakasam to oppose the Rowlatt Act. At their request, Mahatma Gandhi visited Madras and they had discussion with him and decided to oppose the Act through satyagraha. Hence satyagraha sabhas were formed to enlist volunteers and force the government to withdraw the Rowlatt Act. A satyagraha pledge was drawn up by

---

2 By the Rowlatt Act, the accused was not given the privilege to defend himself. It was commented by Motilal Nehru as 'no power, no appeal, no argument' (G.O.No. 381, Pub., 2 July 1919; The Hindu, 8 March 1919; B.C. Bamford, Histories of Non-Cooperation and Khilafat Movement (Confl.) (Delhi, 1925), p.3).


Mahatma Gandhi and all the Indians were asked to sign it. He fixed 6th April 1919 for an all India satyagraha and as a day of national humiliation by fasting, prayer and penance. Throughout the Tamil Province satyagraha was observed by observing twenty four hours fasting, processions and meetings. Shops were closed. It is remarkable to note that in Madras Muhammadans and ladies were present in large numbers than in any other political meetings. In short, Madras Presidency presented quite a remarkable appearance. To bring down the raising tempo of the satyagraha, the government issued explanatory leaflets in Tamil justifying the Rowlatt Act. The culmination of this Movement, at last ended with the tyrannical display of force and massacre of participants at Jallianwallabagh in Punjab, on 13th April 1919. The satyagrahists were brutally shot dead by General Dyer. The news of the Jallianwallabagh massacre shook the whole of India. Immediately, C. Rajagopalachari, Secretary of the Madras satyagraha sabha, suspended the satyagraha in Madras on the advice of Mahatma Gandhi. Following this, martial law was declared in Punjab. In spite of official secrecy, the reports of the martial law atrocities leaked out. Throughout India, people became angry. But the Congress did not take any action expecting that the Hunter Committee appointed by the British Government to enquire into the matter would do justice. The

---

4 The Hindu, 10 Mar. 1919; Desabhitam, 31 Mar. 1919, p.548 (MNR).
5 The Hindu, 24 Mar. 1919.
7 New India, 15 Apr. 1919.
Amritsar Congress Session held in December 1919, though condemned all these atrocities, permitted the Congressmen to contest elections to the Legislative Council according to the Mont-Ford Act.\(^{10}\)

The Congress also appointed a sub committee of Non-officials to collect evidence relating to the outbreak of the Punjab disturbances and the methods employed for their suppression. The subcommittee termed the firing at Jallianwallabagh, a calculated piece of inhumanity unparalleled for its ferocity in the history of modern British administration. The report concluded with a demand for the recall of the Viceroy and the dismissal of the various officials involved in the atrocity. The Hunter Committee did not examine the evidence produced by the sub committee of the Indian National congress.\(^{11}\) Justified the action of General Dyer and believed that a state of rebellion existed necessitating or justifying the adoption of martial law.\(^{12}\) It came with an added shock to the public opinion, both in India and Great Britain.

Meanwhile, the Khilafat agitation continued with renewed force. A number of Khilafat meetings were held in Madras and the vows of Non-cooperation, boycott and swadeshi were advocated.\(^{13}\)

---

\(^{10}\) Swadesamitran, 2 Jan. 1920; Navasakti 3 Jan. 1920.

\(^{11}\) India in 1920, p.41.


\(^{13}\) Sampad Abhyudaya, 20 May 1920, p.621 (MNR).
S. Satyamurti and S. Kasturi Ranga Iyengar delivered a number of lectures on Khilafat platform in Madras, in which they emphasized the necessity of the Hindus cooperating with the Muslims, in the Khilafat agitation\textsuperscript{14}. The draft terms of peace reached between the Allied powers and Axis powers in April 1920 was unsatisfactory to the Muslims and it served to stimulate the agitation. The meeting of the All India Khilafat Committee held in Bombay on 12\textsuperscript{th} May 1920 sought the support of Mahatma Gandhi. He advised them to resort to Non-cooperation programme, drawn up by the Congress Sub Committee\textsuperscript{15}.

Mahatma Gandhi also requested the Hindus to join the Movement. Thus, he had taken the unprecedented step of identifying himself with a Muslim religious Movement. The meeting of the AIOC held in Benaras, on 30\textsuperscript{th} May 1920 decided to convene a special Congress Session in Calcutta in September to consider the question of Non-cooperation\textsuperscript{14}. From then on, until September 1920, the scheme of Non-cooperation was published in the columns of Mahatma Gandhi’s Young India. Having pursued for months an elaborate campaign through the press and the platforms, Mahatma Gandhi prepared to launch the Non-cooperation Movement in August 1920.

\textsuperscript{14} Desabhbhandar, 18 Feb. 1920, p.222; 29 Apr. 1920, p.534 (MNR).
\textsuperscript{15} Collected works of Mahatma Gandhi, Jan. – June 1920, Vol. XVII p.413.
\textsuperscript{16} Young India, 2 June 1920.
In the Non-cooperation programme, there was a provision for the council boycott. The Congress was sharply divided on that question. One section of the Congressmen in Tamil Province under the leadership of S. Satyamurti wanted to capture the councils and fight for Swaraj from within the council. They were called the Nationalists or Congress Pro-Changers. They were mainly Madras City centred Congressmen and were the followers of C.R. Das. The other group, led by C. Rajagopalachari, wanted council boycott and were known as Congress Gandhians or Congress No-Changers. Mahatma Gandhi was their guru.

The Congress subcommittee appointed to consider the Non-cooperation question recommended the boycott of the educational institutions and law courts. However, there was no suggestion for the council boycott, though Mahatma Gandhi insisted on its inclusion in the Congress programme. Even the more influential leaders like C.R. Das and Bal Gangadhar Tilak who at first regarded the reforms as so unsatisfactory, decided to contest the election to the new councils. Already, the Amritsar Congress Session had permitted the Congressmen to contest the election. So, there were preparations for contesting elections everywhere, though some Congressmen were against the decision.

---

18 India in 1920, p.37.
Supporters of both the programmes, in order to gain support for their respective programmes, convened a number of meetings. The origin of this factional conflicts can be traced to the MPCC meeting held at Kallidaikurichi in Tinnevelly district in June 1920. In that meeting C. Rajagopalachari passed a resolution supporting the council boycott, in spite of the opposition from S. Srinivasa Iyengar, S. Satyamurti and S. Kasturi Renga Iyengar.20

However, the Pro-Changers refused to feel bound by that resolution and continued election propaganda. Ever since the Kallidaikurichi conference, till the Calcutta Congress special Session in September 1920, these two rival factions were always at logger heads. S. Kasturi Renga Iyengar, a critic of the council boycott, through his newspaper The Hindu attacked the council boycott programme. He criticized Mahatma Gandhi for not consulting the other political leaders of the country, while drawing the council boycott programme. Finally, the meeting of the Madras Provincial Congress Committee held at Tinnevelly in July 1920, committed itself and other Congress organizations in Tamil Nadu to work together in the ensuing election.21

But the question did not end with that. Attended by the Pro-Changers, No-Changers and the Moderates, a meeting of the Madras Provincial Congress

20 Madras Mail, 24 June 1920; FR, July 1920.
21 Eugene F. Isaac, Politics and Social Conflict in South India, p.194.
22 Young India, 21 July 1920.
Committee was held in Madras, on 15th August 1920, to discuss the Non-cooperation programme. The Moderates maintained that the Non-cooperation Movement was an unconstitutional method designed to paralyse the government. So, it was opposed to the tenets of the Congress whose object was to gain Self-Government by constitutional means. The No-Changers wanted to follow the Non-cooperation programme in its entirety. The Pro-Changers recommended that Non-cooperation barring council boycott should be adopted. After a long discussion the principle of Non-cooperation was accepted, but it was decided that the programme to be followed should be drawn up later. The Pro-Changer’s disapproval of the council boycott was mainly due to two reasons.

The main reason was that if they refrained from contesting election, the Moderates in general and the Justice Party in particular would get all the seats and would cooperate with the government. The other one was, they thought that through the Legislative Council, they could make some progress by virtue of legislative powers granted to popular representatives. S. Srinivasa Iyengar did not agree with those who thought that constitutional agitation was altogether useless. According to him what they gained till then was only by constitutional

---

24 Ibid., Annie Besant, "Non-Cooperation" in Avadi Meeting, Gandhian Non-Cooperation or Shall India Commit Suicide: Against Non-Cooperation for all Indian Parties (Madras, 1920), p.32.
25 Young India, 14 July 1920; CWMG, July – Nov. 1920, Vol. XVIII, p.41.
agitation. He, therefore, thought that Non-cooperation with the government in its entirety was thoroughly unconstitutional\textsuperscript{26}.

Meanwhile, the No-Changers made efforts to enlist more support for their council boycott programme. They first turned to Muslims. Taking advantage of the politics in the Madras Khilafat Committee, C. Rajagopalachari took side with Yakub Hasan\textsuperscript{27} against Abdul Majid Sharar\textsuperscript{28} in their struggle for control of the Madras Khilafat Committee. In May 1920, he was able to steer the Madras Khilafat Committee away from Abdul Majid Sharar’s aggressive Pan-Islamism and into close cooperation with the Gandhi\textsuperscript{29}s. Mahatma Gandhi also conducted an extensive propaganda tour on mass education. In the course of his lectures, he attacked the British Empire and the Government of India and preached Non-cooperation. Because of his nation-wide tour, Mahatma Gandhi soon emerged as a national leader with the widest appeal both among the educated classes and the masses\textsuperscript{30}. He appealed to the masses that if the Khilafat issue was not satisfactorily solved or the peace terms were not revised as promised, they should start Non-cooperation on 1st August 1920\textsuperscript{31}. Since their demands were not met, on

\textsuperscript{26} Annie Besant, “Non-cooperation”, p.35.
\textsuperscript{27} Yakub Hasan was a Muslim merchant from north India who later settled down in Madras City and was one of the founder members of the Muslim League. He was also an active Congress member.
\textsuperscript{28} Abdul Majid Sharar was a proponent of Pan-Islamism and the editor of the Urdu newspaper Quami Report.
\textsuperscript{29} Fortnightly Report, 17 May 1920, David Arnold, Nationalism and Regional Politics, p.63.
\textsuperscript{31} Ibid.
1st August 1920, Mahatma Gandhi himself inaugurated the Movement by his letter to the Viceroy. The death of Bal Gangadhar Tilak on that day was a severe blow to the Pro-Changers and Mahatma Gandhi became an undisputed leader of the Congress. Mahatma Gandhi and Shaukat Ali again visited Madras in August and gave lectures on Non-cooperation. As a result, the No-Changers gained popularity.

The next round of the struggle began in the Calcutta Congress special Session, held on 4-8th September 1920 under the presidency of Lala Lajpat Rai. It witnessed a determined opposition to the Non-cooperation programme. Along with Annie Besant, Madras Nationalists such as S. Satyamurti, S. Srinivasa Iyengar, A. Rangaswami Iyengar, V.O. Chidambaram Pillai and S. Kasturi Ranga Iyengar voted against the boycott resolution. When the voting was registered, all the provinces except Central Province and Berar voted in favour of Mahatma Gandhi’s resolution on boycott.

Finally, the resolution on Non-cooperation was passed by 1885 against 873 votes. Among the Madras delegates, 161 voted for the resolution and 135 against it.

---

32 Yound India, 4 Aug. 1920.
34 Young India, 15 Sep. 1920.
In the sub committee all the Muslims except Muhammed Ali Jinnah voted in support of Mahatma Gandhi, while many Non-muslim Nationalists supported C.R. Das who led the opposition to Mahatma Gandhi. Mahatma Gandhi faced considerable opposition on the question of triple boycott. But the extreme disappointment in the matter of the redressal of the Punjab and Khilafat misdeeds and the illusory nature of the reforms, coupled with the towering personality of Mahatma Gandhi enabled him to carry out his programme through the Congress. The analysis of the votes indicates that most of the provinces were for Non-cooperation. However, compared to the total number of 5,873 delegates were only 1,855. This shows that the nation was not prepared for Non-cooperation at that time Mahatma Gandhi promised that if the Non-violent Non-cooperation was carried out, Swaraj could be obtained within one year.

The Non-cooperation programme consisted of surrender of titles and honorary offices and resignation from nominated seats in local bodies; refusal to attend government offices, durbars and other official and semi-official functions held by the government officials or in their honour; gradual withdrawal of children from schools and colleges, owned, aided and controlled by government and in place of such schools and colleges, establishment of national schools and colleges; gradual boycott of British courts by lawyers, litigants and the

---

37 B. C. Barnford, Histories of Non-Cooperation and Khilafat Movements, p.16.
38 Under Secretary’s Safe File, No. 328 (Secret), 15 Nov. 1921.
establishment of private arbitration courts for the settlement of private disputes; refusal on the part of the military, clerical and labouring classes to offer themselves as recruits for services in Mesopotamia; withdrawal by candidates of their candidature for election to the Legislative Council and refusal on the part of the voters to vote for any candidate who might despite the Congress advice, offer himself or herself for election; and the boycott of foreign goods.\(^{39}\)

As a mark of protest, many Pro-Changers resigned from their respective Congress organizations. Notable among them in Tamil Province were S. Kasturi Renga Iyengar, the then President of the MPCC and A. Rengaswamy Iyengar and S. Satyamurti, its Secretaries\(^{40}\). V.O. Chidambaram Pillai also resigned from the Congress, opposing Non-cooperation programme in total\(^{41}\).

On the other hand, with the resignation of Pro-Changers from the Madras Provincial Congress Committee, they lost control of the Congress and the Pro-Gandhian associates of C. Rajagopalachari entered the office. A Pro-Gandhian lawyer T.V. Venkatarama Iyer was elected as President of the Madras Provincial Congress Committee, T.S.S. Rajan and C. Rajagopalachari were its Vice-Presidents. With the exception of the Khilafat Muslim League of Youth Group and a few

---

\(^{39}\) Ibid.; Young India, 15 Sep. 1920; HINC, 1916-20, Vol. VII, p.58.


\(^{41}\) R.A Padmanabhan, V.O. Chidambaram Pillai, p.68.
mofussil leaders, No-Changers occupied the remaining places\(^\text{42}\). Thus, in the struggle between the No-Changers and Pro-Changers over the issue of council boycott, the exponents of Mahatma Gandhi came out victorious and they started the Non-cooperation Movement to attain Swaraj.

The council boycott was an important as well as immediate programme of the Non-cooperation Movement designed to ensure the collapse of the Reform Scheme through the boycott of elections to the Provincial Legislative Council. Special preparations were made by the Congress to deal with the boycott of elections. The Congress Executive Committee had appointed a propaganda sub-committee of staunch Non-cooperators to carry on vigorous campaigning\(^\text{43}\). As a first step, the Non-cooperators asked the young people to canvass for signatures in the prescribed form to make the contestants withdraw from the contests\(^\text{44}\).

In spite of the repeated warnings of the government not to carry on any propaganda against council elections\(^\text{45}\), the Congress and the Khilafat Committee carried on vigorous propaganda, not only to force the candidates to withdraw from contests, but also to make the voters abstain from voting\(^\text{46}\). On the

\(^{42}\) David Arnold, Nationalism and Regional Politics, p. 69, 1973, University of Sussex.

\(^{43}\) Young India, 13 Oct. 1920.

\(^{44}\) Under Secretary's Safe File, No. 307-A (Secret), 4 Dec. 1920.

\(^{45}\) G.O. No. 706, Pub. 2 Nov. 1920.

\(^{46}\) Ibid., Copy of a report No. 2221-1/1 D. 15 Oct. 1920, from the Commissioner of Police, Madras regarding the Khilafat agitation (Strictly Confi.) in USSF. No. 307-A (Secret), 4 Dec. 1920.
other hand, the Justice party carried on the election propaganda, appealed the voters to vote for them and not to vote for any Brahmins.

In spite of the no vote campaign by C. Rajagopalachari, T.S.S. Rajan, P. Varadarajulu Naidu, Maulvi Murtuza Saheb, Yakub Hasan and others, the election to the new council took place in November 1920 with the support of the Justice Party. On the occasion of the election, special efforts were made by the Congress to dissuade the voters from going to the polls. In Kumbakonam on the election day, all the shops and hotels were closed, the rickshaws and other vehicles were off the road. A tense situation developed leading to clashes between the Non-cooperators and cooperators. Public properties were damaged and the cooperators were attacked.

In spite of the efforts of the Non-cooperators, council boycott was only a partial success. Candidates contested for all the seats in the Madras Legislative Council and also for every seat allotted to the Madras Presidency in the Indian Legislative Assembly.

---

50 G.O.No. 654, Pub., 29 Sep. 1921.
But the total number of votes polled was comparatively low. That is, out of the total of 12,48,156 voters only 3,03,558 turned up to vote\textsuperscript{51}. That means, out of 29.4 per cent of the people in Madras Presidency who were enfranchised, only 24.9 percent of the people voted in the general election\textsuperscript{52}. But, in the case of the Madras City and Chengleput over 50 percent polled and the percentage of electors exceeded expectations\textsuperscript{53}. It was due to the predominance of the Congress Pro-Changers and Home Rulers there.

Out of the ninety eight seats in the Madras Legislative Council, the Justice Party secured sixty three seats. Among them fifty seven were Non-Brahmins and six were Europeans and Anglo Indians. The Liberals and Home Rulers, all of them were Brahmins, won seventeen seats. Rest of the eighteen seats were captured by the independent candidates. Of them, thirteen were Muhammadans and five were Indian Christians\textsuperscript{54}. Madras Presidency also sent sixteen elected members to the Indian Legislative Assembly \textsuperscript{55}. Even the Congress Pro-Changers like S. Srinivasa Iyengar, K.V. Rengaswami Iyengar and P. Subbarayan refused to withdraw their candidature and they were elected\textsuperscript{56}. P.V. Narasimha Iyer, a member of the AICC

\textsuperscript{51} Letter from the Acting Secretary, Govt. of Madras to the Secretary, Govt. of India, Fort St. George, 12 Dec. 1921 in G.O.No. 280, Law (Leg.), 12 Dec. 1921.
\textsuperscript{53} Report of the Administration of the Madras Presidency, 1919-20, P.X.
\textsuperscript{54} Memoranda of the Madras Government, p.17.
\textsuperscript{55} G.O.No. 280, Law (Leg.), 12 Dec. 1921.
\textsuperscript{56} David Arnold, Nationalism and Regional Politics, p.70, 1973, University of Sussex.
from Madras also contested the election and entered the council. Deciding that he should not entirely and blindly accept the decisions of Mahatma Gandhi, S. Srinivasa Iyengar successfully contested the university seat and became a member of the Madras Legislative council.

The Congress Liberals turned up to vote. From Madras, the Liberals like C.P. Ramaswami Iyer, P.S. Sivaswami Iyer and V.S. Srinivasa Sastri were elected. Annie Besant and her followers who did counter propaganda and went to the poll. Many people who had been quite closely associated with the Congress before it slid into Non-cooperation and election boycott found it easy to cut their contacts and contest the elections any way. They included N.A.V. Somasundaram Pillai and T.N. Sivagnanam Mudaliar, both of them became staunch Justicites in the Madras Legislative Council after the election of 1920.

On the other hand, though S. Satyamurti felt that the existence of the Justice Party needed cooperation rather than Non-cooperation, when the resolution was passed, he agreed to abide by it, more to honour Mahatma Gandhi's personality than any acceptance or faith in his programme. But he did not give up his

---

97 Navasakti, 16 Dec. 1920.
100 Both of them had previously organized the Congress Provincial Conference in June 1920 and ten others who had been appointed district organizers for the Congress (Christopher John Baker, The Politics of South India, 1920-1937, p.35.)
membership in the Madras University. C. Vijayaraghavachari also withdrew his candidature. Despite his opposition to the council boycott, Yakub Hasan resigned his seat in the Legislative Council. A. Rangaswami Iyengar also finally accepted the Congress mandate.

These Pro-Changers of Madras went along with the council boycott programme, but without proper understanding or faith in Mahatma Gandhi's programme. Though, many of them did not contest the election, they kept quiet without doing any propaganda work in favour of council boycott. They were waiting for an opportunity to revive their programme. In 1921, when the Gandhian programme became a failure, they joined with other Congressmen in several parts of India to form the Swaraj Party to fight within the council. In general, the council boycott didn't succeed in evoking general enthusiasm in any considerable section of the people. The most important reason for the failure of the council boycott was the Justice Party which had great backing among the Non-Brahmins. Inadequate time and funds to stage a more extensive no vote campaign by the Congress was also another reason. It helped the Justice Party that contested in all the seats and formed ministry in the Madras Presidency. The failure of the council boycott was the first and crucial set back for the Non-cooperation Movement in Madras.

---

63 The Hindu, 23 Sep. 1920.
Those who favoured the Non-cooperation in the Calcutta Congress Session captured the Congress and launched an anti-British political Movement of an all India character. They adopted various techniques of mass contact and built upon their organizational networks. The next few months witnessed an intensive propaganda campaign conducted all over the country by the Congress members. As a first step to mobilize the masses, Mahatma Gandhi and Shaukat Ali led a propaganda tour throughout India and they came to Madras on 12th August 1920. Mahatma Gandhi attended many meetings in Madras. The meetings attracted large number of masses towards Non-cooperation including K. Santhanam and N.S. Varadachari⁴⁴ both of them later became very popular.

To spread the Non-cooperation message among the masses, a propaganda sub-committee consisting of T.V. Kalyana Sundara Mudaliar, Balambal, Abdul Majid Sharar, P. Varadarajulu Naidu, T. Adi Narayana Chetti, G. Suryanarayana, C. Subramania Mudaliar, T.S.S. Rajan, C. Rajagopalachari, Sayad Murtuza and S. Abdul Majid Sharar, was formed by the MPCC⁵⁵.

They toured throughout Madras Presidency for preaching the ideal of Non-cooperation and the implementation of the same.

⁵⁵ Navasakti, 16 Aug. 1920; Young India, 13 Oct. 1920.
The Madras Khilafat Committee had appointed workers in all the districts. Leaflets and voters declaration forms were issued. The result was that eight high court vakils had given up their careers, put up khadi and carried out any work in the Madras City. Big meetings were held there66. Swaraj processions were also held in order to attract the masses towards the Movement67. In January 1921, the leaders of the Non-cooperation Movement had redoubled their efforts to win recruits to the cause.

Under the auspices of the local Khilafat committee, an organization known as the Swaraj volunteers corp was formed for propaganda work throughout Madras Presidency. Many Hindus and Muslims joined that body as volunteers.68

The Non-cooperation Khilafat Movement was placed on a practical working basis after the Nagpur Congress Session in December 1920. It adopted a new Congress constitution by changing the creed of the Congress, from the attainment of Swaraj by the people of India by constitutional means, into the attainment of the same, by all legitimate and peaceful means69.

More than 20,000 delegates from all over India attended that Congress Session70. C. Vijayaraghavachari, who opposed the Non-cooperation resolution in

---

66 Young India, 13 Oct. 1920.
67 Desabhartan, 10 Jan. 1921, p.52 (MNR)
68 Under Secretary’s Safe File, No. 307-A (Secret), 4 Dec. 1920.
69 FR. 17 Feb. 1921.
70 Young India, 5 Jan 1921; The Hindu, 8 Jan. 1921, p.53 (MNR) ; EINC 1916-20, Vol.VII, p.663.
the Calcutta Congress Session, presided over it. This time, there was no such severe opposition to the Non-cooperation programme like the Calcutta Congress Session.

The Nagpur Congress Session appealed to the people to identify themselves with the Non-cooperation Movement. It finally adopted for itself, a village based constitution which would transform the Congress into a mass organization and an instrument of effective action. A Congress Working Committee (CWC) was created making the Indian National Congress an active and functioning body throughout the year. The AICC was expanded from 181 members in 1920 to 350 in 1921. At the regional level, the Congress provinces were reorganized along linguistic lines to facilitate communication with the masses. Various sabhas and committees were formed under the aegis of the AICC. Over 1,100 village sabhas were formed in the Madras Presidency with the membership of over 15,000. The creation of these village sabhas gave the Congress, a mass base.

The visit of Mahatma Gandhi, Ali Brothers and other prominent Congress and Khilafat leaders, also imparted tremendous enthusiasm. Women were inspired with the feelings of genuine adoration for Mahatma Gandhi and they contributed their jewels to the Congress cause. They broke coconuts in front of

---

71 The Hindu, 3 Jan. 1921.
73 Fortnightly Report, 18 Apr. 1921.
Mahatma Gandhi, burnt camphor and presented him holy water. Such was the influence that Mahatma Gandhi had upon the masses of Tamil Province. The Madras Mahajana Sabha also adopted the Non-cooperation programme by a large majority, after prolonged deliberations. Mahatma Gandhi again visited Madras, on 15th September 1921, the day after the arrest of Muhammad Ali at Waltair and visited the southern districts. A momentum was added by the lecturing tours of Mahatma Gandhi and other leaders from north India and were immediately followed by meetings. Spurred on by Mahatma Gandhi's tour, Non-cooperation Movement achieved a considerable success in Madras Presidency in 1920-21.

Pro-Congress newspapers of Madras such as Navasakti, Tamil Nadu, Swadesamitran and Quami Report played a vital role in mobilizing the masses. The most promising vernacular paper was Desabhaktan of T.V. Kalyana Sundara Mudaliar. C. Rajagopalachari was able to convert Desabhaktan as an organ for his group. He also contributed Rs.10,000 from the Congress fund to help finance a new English paper Swarajya, in order to promote Non-cooperation.

---

74 Justice, 9 Apr. 1921, p.456 (MNR).
75 The Hindu, 14 Apr. 1921.
76 Fortnightly Report, 6 Oct. 1921.
78 David Arnold, The Congress in Tamilnad, p.51.
Due to all these efforts, many people enlisted themselves as Congress volunteers. Even the Pro-changers like S. Srinivasa Iyengar and S. Satyamurti took an active part in the propaganda.79

The introduction of linguistic provinces, a many-tiered organization from village level upwards, and an open membership ensured a regular income and enabled a minimum of Congress work. All this helped in the establishment of a popular base.

Paradoxically, the programme of Non-cooperation was not meant for mass participation, though Congress aimed that. It was drafted accidentally for the professionals, students, title holders and government servants, not for the masses. Boycott of elections was meant for only about one-tenth of the adult male population, who were enfranchised by the Franchise committee. That too it was only the tax payers, retired, pensioned or discharged officers or men of the regular forces. Other boycotts such as boycott of government schools, colleges and a courts and the abandonment of titles, resignation of honorary offices and government jobs and the boycott of foreign goods were not for the masses to contribute. These programmes did not make an attractive appeal to the interests and ambitions of the masses. Realizing the fact, the Congress whole-heartedly

79 Andhra Patrika, 30 Dec.1921, p.37 (MNR).
supported the picketing of liquor and foreign cloth shops, even though they were not included in the original Non-cooperation programme.

Another important item of the Non-cooperation Movement, was the boycott of government controlled schools and colleges, for if middle class youths destined for careers in the bureaucracy and the professions, could be persuaded to cut off their highly advantageous links with the government. It would set an example of self-discipline and sacrifice for the rest of the population. Hence, the Non-cooperators persuaded students to leave schools and colleges run by the government\textsuperscript{80}. A students' Non-cooperation Association was formed by the Congress and the students were induced to leave their studies\textsuperscript{81}. Students also formed volunteer corps and issued printed pamphlets relating to Non-cooperation\textsuperscript{82}. They also held number of meetings in Madras and the mofussil areas, where inflammatory speeches were made\textsuperscript{83}. As a result, students of Muhammadan College, Madras held a meeting in November 1920, to discuss the question of leaving the college in imitation of the Aligarh students. Only one student opposed the suggestion, seven were ready to quit at once, and the rest wanted to consult their parents\textsuperscript{84}. Some students studying in the Madras

\textsuperscript{81} Fortnightly Report, 2 Feb. 1921.
\textsuperscript{82} Swadesamitran, 31 Dec. 1922, p.14 (MNR).
\textsuperscript{83} Fortnightly Report, 3 Dec. 1920.
\textsuperscript{84} Under Secretary's Safe File, No.307-A (Secret), 4 Dec. 1920.
Pachaiyappa's, Presidency and Madras-I-Azam Colleges discontinued their studies. Till March 1921, 820 students gave up their studies.

Because of heavy propaganda, initially students Movement gained much strength in Madras, but soon began showing signs of decline. It was mainly because the Congress had no substitute institution to offer education for the students who left their studies. National schools started in several places were unable to carry on for a long time. The other reason was that the Congress had no organized national employment to offer enthusiastic Nationalists. When that became clear to the students, most of them returned to the educational institutions. The parents of students were, as a body opposed to Non-cooperation in educational institutions. Muhammadan feeling in Madras was also strongly against the boycott of schools. Even within the Congress, there were difference of opinion regarding the boycott of educational institutions. While C. Rajagopalachari and other Congressmen were trying to persuade students to leave the colleges, S. Satyamurti, A. Rangaswami Iyengar and T.V. Venkatarama Iyer were still attending the meetings of the Madras University Senate.

---

85 Andhra Patrika, 18 Nov. 1920, p.1443 (MNR).
90 David Arnold, Nationalism and Regional Politics, p.80.
Along with the boycott of government schools, Mahatma Gandhi made an appeal to the people, to renounce their government titles and offices, law courts and legislatures\(^{32}\). Vigorous propaganda on behalf of the Non-cooperation and Khilafat Movements succeeded in inducing many persons to resign their titles and honorary offices\(^{32}\). In pursuance of the Congress resolution, V.S. Subramania Iyer, W.G. Vasudevayya, V.M. Ramaswami Iyer, K.V. Subba Rao and D.S. Gopalachariar suspended their practices and they constituted themselves into a provincial committee to do Congress work in accordance with the new constitution\(^{33}\).

In Madras, thirty five subordinate government servants and thirty three village officers had resigned till January 1922\(^{34}\). Fifty one persons had resigned their honorary offices such as Honorary Magistrates and Municipal Councilors and six persons had relinquished the titles before April 1921\(^{35}\). The government ordered that the government officials should not invite to any functions, the persons who resigned the titles or offices to convey his adherence to Non-Cooperation Movement\(^{36}\).

---
\(^{32}\) Collected works of Mahatma Gandhi, Nov.1920, Vol.XIV, P.VII.
\(^{33}\) G.O.No.332, Pub., (Confl.), 25 May 1921.
\(^{34}\) The Hindu, 16 Jan. 1921.
\(^{35}\) G.O.No. 291-92, Pub., 1 Apr. 1922.
\(^{36}\) G.O.No. 249, Pub., 25 Apr. 1921.
On the whole, the Congress programme of triple boycott met only with a partial success in Madras, although Mahatma Gandhi declared that it was only by such means, Swaraj could be achieved. Picketing of liquor shops and the boycott of foreign clothes met with considerable success.

The government imposed a tax for cutting firewood and cattle grazing. As a mark of protest, the Non-cooperators violated the forest laws. They disobeyed the forest regulations in Trichinopoly, Nellore and Cudappa.

In North Arcot, Tanjore and Salem, cattle and sheep were grazed in restricted areas, fuel and manure were collected without authorization. Forest boundary marks were destroyed and subordinates of the forest department were assaulted. At Vedaranyam, about 500 Congressmen sent their cattle and sheep into the Point Calimer forest without license. This form of encouraging violation of the forest regulations resulted in many prosecutions and few encounters between villagers and the authorities. The government took severe measures to deal with forest offences and brought the situation under control. No doubt, this programme had given an opportunity for the masses to display their strength and solidarity.

---
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In order to inaugurate the new constitution, the British king announced in his Royal Proclamation, that he would send the Prince of Wales to India. As he was not in good health, in his place the Prince of Connaught was sent. The Nagpur Congress Session passed a resolution unanimously asking the people not to participate in the functions and festivals arranged by the government in connection with the visit of the Duke, as a part of the Non-cooperation programme\textsuperscript{103}.

Mahatma Gandhi had pointed out that the reason for boycotting the visit of the Duke was that the Ministers of England intended to use these Royal personages as agents for carrying out a policy which was unacceptable to the Congress and for creating and impression in the public mind detrimental to the true interests of the people of India. It was this instinct which inspired Mahatma Gandhi to advocate this course\textsuperscript{104}.

As soon as the Congress delegates returned from Nagpur, they set to work on the visit of the Duke of Connaught. For a week intense campaign for his boycott was carried on. Posters carrying inscriptions like 'Boycott Connaught', 'Connaught can't redress our wrongs' and 'Remember Jallianwallah' appeared in many parts of Madras Province\textsuperscript{105}.

\textsuperscript{103} G.O.No.701, Pub., 8 Apr. 1921; The Hindu, 8 Jan. 1921, p.53; Swadesamitran, 7 Jan. 1921, p.64 (MNR); ENC, 1916-20, Vol.VII, p.663.
\textsuperscript{104} The Hindu, 8 Jan. 1921, p.53 (MNR).
\textsuperscript{105} Fortnightly Report, 24 Jan. 1921; Young India, 26 Jan. 1921; Desabhaktan 7 Jan. 1921, p.64 (MNR).
The meeting was held on 9th January in Madras and large procession went throughout the streets carrying banners, inciting the people to boycott the visit\textsuperscript{106}. There was a complete hartal on 10\textsuperscript{th} January 1921, the day of his arrival. People held demonstrations and according to The Hindu, the gathering was over 60,000. But the officials welcomed the Duke and he performed the inauguration ceremony of the new Legislative Council\textsuperscript{107}.

Within a short time, the visit of the Prince of Wales was announced. The AICC met in July 1921 passed a resolution to boycott him also\textsuperscript{108}. On 13th January 1922, the Prince visited Madras, when the Non-cooperation Movement was in full swing\textsuperscript{109}. Though boycott of the Prince was not a part of the Non-cooperation programme, the Congress utilized the opportunity to forge unity among the forces opposed to the British Raj and the day was observed with hartals\textsuperscript{110}. In some places it resulted into violence. For instance, about 200 persons held up six tram cars and pelted stones and smashed the window glass panes. They shouted 'Mahatma Gandhi Ki Jai'. Motar cars belonging to the Europeans were stoned by them. Many shops were also closed\textsuperscript{111}.

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{106} Portightly Report, 24 Jan. 1921; Desabdhaktan 10 Jan. 1921, p.82 (MNR).
\textsuperscript{107} Navasakti, 25 Jan. 1921; Muhammedan, 13 Jan. 1921, p.66 (MNR); RAMP, 1921-22, p.38.
\textsuperscript{108} Navasakti, 21 July 1921; FR, 6 Jan. 1922.
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\end{flushleft}
The volunteers also stoned the Willington cinema company, because they hoisted loyal flags. The company reacted by firing and killed a Muslim from Triplicane. In their attempt to suppress the Movement, the government killed two and wounded two volunteers.\(^{112}\) Even though the Prince was able to complete his visit, due to the cooperation of Justice Party, it helped the masses to display their anger towards the alien rule. The adversaries of the Movement were the British Raj, Congress Moderates, Home Rulers, Congress Pro-Changers and the Justice Party. T.V. Seethagiri Iyer, a Congress Moderate and a member of the Indian Legislative Assembly opposed it.\(^{113}\) Annie Besant in her New India attacked it. Other newspapers such as West Coast-Spectator and Cochin Argus were much against it.

The Pro-Changers as mentioned earlier, opposed the council boycott. The Justice and The Mail were strong opponents of the Movement and supported the government policies to suppress that.\(^{114}\) The Non-Brahmin Federation of Madras called upon all Indians to strongly oppose the Non-cooperation Movement.\(^{115}\) Members of the Justice Party in the Madras Legislative Council helped the Governor to frame laws to suppress it.\(^{116}\) They also organized several meetings in

---

\(^{112}\) C. Rajagopalachari, Jail Diary, Being Notes made by him in Vellore Jail from December 1921 to March 1922 (Madras, 1922), p.4.

\(^{113}\) Navasakki, 16 Dec. 1920.


\(^{115}\) G.O.No.171, Pub., 20 Mar. 1921.

\(^{116}\) Andhra Patrika 21 Jan. 1922, p.50 (MNE).
Madras and mofussil areas against Non-cooperation\textsuperscript{117}. They also started an Anti-Non-Cooperation League with the help of the district authorities to suppress it.\textsuperscript{118} From the beginning, the government took severe action to prevent the spread of it. The government servants who attended Non-cooperation meetings or helped in their propaganda works were dismissed from service\textsuperscript{119}. It also took action against the press that supported Non-cooperation Movement\textsuperscript{120}. For example, security of Rs.2,000 was taken from A. Rangaswami Iyengar, the keeper of the Swadesamitran press for printing satyagraha leaflets\textsuperscript{121}. A security of Rs.500 was demanded from the publisher of the weekly journal Sukhodayam since he introduced political matters into it. The publisher failed to furnish the security and the paper was discontinued\textsuperscript{122}. The printer and publisher of the Tamil weekly, the Sowrashta was warned for publishing in his paper political views\textsuperscript{123}. The government also prosecuted the editor of Vaisyamitran for publishing an article entitled 'The pitiable plight of the Madras Government'\textsuperscript{124}. The joint editor of Desabhaktan was prosecuted and convicted of and sentenced to six months simple imprisonment for the article 'Repression' in its issue on 6th May 1921\textsuperscript{125}. Lalgudi Mohammed

\textsuperscript{117} G.O. No. 477, Pub., 27 July 1921; FR, 19 July 1921.
\textsuperscript{118} Swarajya, 28 Aug. 1926, p.1150 (MNR).
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Sulaiman Gulam Ahmed, the editor of the Quami Report, was prosecuted for the article "Malabar atrocities"\footnote{G.O. No.481, Pub. (Confl.), 2 June 1922.}

Important leaders like C. Rajagopalachari, M.V. Subramania Sastri, Subramania Siva, E.V. Ramaswami Naicker, P. Varadarajulu Naidu and Yakub Hasan were also imprisoned\footnote{Fortnightly Report, 10 Dec. 1921; Tamil Nadu, 25 Dec. 1921, p.12 (MNR); C. Rajagopalachari, Jail Diary, p.4.}. From January to March 1921, 131 persons were prosecuted under section 188 IPC. 250 persons were prosecuted under security section of the Cr. PC and 204 persons were bound over or committed to imprisonment for failure to furnish security in the Madras Presidency\footnote{G.O.No.245, Pub., 26 Mar. 1921; G.O.No.687, Pub. (Confl.), 12 Oct. 1921; G.O.No.692, Pub. (Confl.), 13 Oct. 1921.}. In the district jail of South Arcot itself there were 176 Non-cooperators\footnote{Proceedings of the Madras Legislative Council (Hereafter PMLC), Sep.1922, Vol.VIII, p.156.}. Action under the preventive sections of the Cr. PC were taken. Even then the Movement lingered on.

On 5th February 1922, at Chauri Chaura in the United Provinces, a mob of 2,000 villagers, led by volunteers attacked a police station and burnt to death the entire police personnel's consisting of twenty two\footnote{G.O.No.305, Pub., 14 Apr. 1923; Stephen Hesvingsham, Peasant Movements in Colonial India : North Bihar, 1917-1942, (Canberra, 1980), p.104.}. Mahatma Gandhi, much worried over the incident, decided to suspend the Movement. The CWC met in Bardoli on 11th February 1922 suspended the Non-cooperation Movement and
adopted constructive programmes\textsuperscript{131}. The AICC meeting in Delhi confirmed the Bardoli resolution, but it permitted individual civil disobedience with certain restrictions\textsuperscript{132}. The abrupt withdrawal of the campaign encouraged the British Government to resort to rigorous repression. The Government of India held the Non-cooperation Movement responsible for all the disturbances in India during 1921-22 and arrested Mahatma Gandhi on 10th March 1922. He was sentenced to six years imprisonment\textsuperscript{133}.

Soon after Mahatma Gandhi's arrest, lawyers began to return to the courts, students to schools and colleges and politicians to the council. The AICC met in Lucknow in June 1922 appointed a Civil Disobedience Enquiry Committee to review the events of the past two years and to chalk out an appropriate course of action\textsuperscript{134}.

The Civil Disobedience Enquiry Committee and the Khilafat Committee visited Madras on 25th July. 1922. Majority of the witnesses expressed themselves against mass civil disobedience and also against the boycott of law courts and schools. On the question of council boycott, opinion was divided\textsuperscript{135}. Motilal Nehru, Hakim Ajmal Khan, S. Satyamurti and V.J. Patel were for revoking the

\textsuperscript{131} New India, 27 Feb. 1922.
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boycott while C. Rajagopalachari, Dr.M.A. Ansari and S. Kasturi Ranga Iyengar were for continuing it.

Though the followers of Mahatma Gandhi had found themselves in a steadily deteriorating position, they had continued the Non-cooperation Movement with the hope that Mahatma Gandhi would be able to review the situation on his release. But order under section 144 Cr. PC was issued prohibiting them from taking part in any public meetings or processions and twenty persons who disobeyed the order were arrested\(^{136}\).

Picketing of liquor shops and foreign cloth boycott were continued even after Mahatma Gandhi's arrest. In 1923, C. Rajagopalachari suspended them in response to the Nagpur flag satyagraha. He along with his followers in Madras attempted to review the Non-cooperation Movement. But they found little support, due to the emergence of Congress Swaraj Party in 1923, with the programme of council entry.

Though, the Non-cooperation Movement failed to achieve its objectives namely redressal of the khilafat wrongs and the attainment of Swaraj, it was an important step in the development of Indian nationalism. No doubt, it led to a general awakening of the masses to their political rights.

\(^{136}\) fortnightly Report, 16 Aug. 1922.