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CHAPTER - III

FACTIONALISM IN TAMIL NADU CONGRESS: (1885-1947)

About 1880 Madras was an extremely diverse and disparate province. Its diversity arose out of many considerations - social, political, economic and linguistic. This diversity laid the foundations for the growth of factions in Tamil Nadu Congress (TNC) too. Madras province was socially and culturally divided as it contained several communities, castes and sub-castes. These differences broadly categorised the people into three strata, namely the Brahmins, non-Brahmins and the Untouchables. The populace was also divided racially into Aryans and Dravidians. Geographically also Madras province was heterogeneous. It incorporated Malabar and South Canara on the west and parts of Telugu and Kannada and Oriya linguistic regions in the north. It covered all the Tamil districts.

In this province, around the turn of the century, the Brahmins of Tamil Nadu wielded the political, economic and social power that was disproportionate to their numbers. The non-Brahmins, from rural agrarian and trading castes, through the ryotwari system and western education regenerated the professional middle class and therefore came into conflict with the Brahmins of the relatively urban areas.
MADRAS MAHAJANA SABHA:

The Brahmin political monopoly first began with Madras Mahajana Sabha. Madras Mahajana Sabha was formally inaugurated at a meeting held in the metropolis in 16th May, 1884. The activists of the Mahajana Sabha were G. Subramania Iyer, Viraraghavachari, Ananda Charlu, Rangiah Naidu, Balaji Rao and Salem Ramaswamy Mudaliar. The objectives of the Mahajana Sabha was 'to bring before the British rulers the views of the public, and to correctly represent the government what the need of the people were and to suggest remedies'. Secondly, it was to devise means 'to improve the condition of the people'. Their aim was to foster the slowly developing sentiments of provincial unity. The leaders of the Mahajana Sabha were drawn from the professional elites and merchants. They were mostly mofussil born. Education was an important criteria to become a member. The Madras Mahajana Sabha held its first Provincial Conference at Pachayyappa's Hall, Madras, in December 1884. They discussed on the issues like 'National fund, Local Self-Government, Civil Service Examination, Mass Education and Arms Act'. They also demanded subsequent instalment of constitutional reform, to help to create and consolidate the native public opinion. The activists of the Mahajana Sabha naturally became the delegates of the first INC Session in 1885, at Bombay.
The first resolution of the First Congress of INC was moved by G. Subramania Iyer, who strongly advocated a Royal Commission to enquire into Indian Administration with adequate representation of Indians thereon and Rangiah Naidu, the first President of Madras Mahajana Sabha moved the next resolution who adversely commented on the military expenditure and pleaded with the government to follow a generous attitude to improve the native army. Thus it was very clear that the delegates from Madras took a leading part in the first Conference of INC. The same enthusiasm and absorbing interest continued and when the third INC Session was held in Madras, 1887, every town of over 10,000 inhabitants organised a sub-committee for vigorous propaganda of Congress policies. Viraraghavachari wrote in Tamil, a Congress catechism and 30,000 copies had been distributed.

The Madras Legislative Council was expanded in 1892, Sankaran Nair and Rangiah Naidu became the non-official representatives in the Provincial Council. In 1894, the Annual Session of INC was held in Madras and in 1897, G. Subramania Iyer represented Madras Presidency to give evidence before the Welby Commission, which was appointed to enquire into Indian Expenditure.5

Thus the Madras Mahajana Sabha was the provincial forerunner of the Indian National Congress. Although the Mahajana Sabha claimed to represent public opinion in the Presidency, its
membership was drawn from a very narrow social base. It was predominately Brahmin in composition. The emergence of the new professional middle class of the non-Brahmins came into conflict with them and thus factionalism began.

1885-1820:

At the end of the 19th Century, a group of men in Madras City emerged as pre-eminent in the business of mediating between the newly important institutions of provincial capital and the many social interests which wanted to exert influence upon them. These men were loosely referred to as the 'Mylapore faction'. They were rich, highly educated and influential. These Mylaporeans counted the Madras provincial branch of the Congress amongst the instruments of its own for achieving provincial prominence. In its hands the aim and organisation of the movement had been somewhat flexible. These Mylaporeans later were termed as 'Moderates'. They were namely, Krishnaswami Iyer, G.A. Natesan, V.S. Srinivasa Sastri, C.P. Ramaswami Iyer and others.

There was another group of men in Madras City, who were called as the 'Egmore clique'. There was not much difference between them and the Mylaporeans in socio-economic status except that they lacked influence, which the Mylaporeans had. So the Mylaporeans were able to gain confidence of both the Government and the Madras Presidency elites, which was the root cause for
the conflict between the Mylapore and Egmore groups.\textsuperscript{7} Later, this Egmore clique was known as 'Extremists' and was led by V.O. Chidambaram Pillai (V.O.C). This Egmore faction had intimate relations with lawyers, merchants and politicians in the districts who had grown to resent the monopoly of the Madras City especially Mylaporeans on leadership issues. It was natural that Rajaji, a lawyer and the Municipal Chairman from Salem, and his group allied with the Egmore clique in 1908 to push the extremist cause against the complacent Mylaporeans. The extremist faction included Subramanya Bharathi, Y. Surendrenath Arya, V. Chakkarai Chetty, S. Doraiswamy, Srinivasachariar and others.\textsuperscript{8}

The disappointment with the moderate politics in Congress began to grow in Tamil Nadu since 1903. The Nineteenth Session of INC held at Madras in 1903 convinced the extremists of the ineffectiveness of merely passing resolutions, and the need for other methods in place of petition and resolutions. Consequently, V.O.C. inspired by the enthusiasm for Swadeshi, formed the first ever Swadeshi Steam Navigation Company at Madras in 1906, to break the monopoly of the British steamers operating between the Madras and Colombo.

When the Surat Session of INC ended in chaos on 26th December 1907, the Madras delegates met in their camp under the Presidency of G. Subramania Iyer. The next morning the moderates of the Tamil Nadu held a similar meeting. The same evening
the extremists again convened a meeting and condemned the resolution of the moderates. The influence of the extremist reaction in the Congress on the delegates from Tamil Nadu was, no doubt, significant enough. In fact the provocative speeches of V.O.C. and Subramania Siva generated 'intense public unrest and official repression'.

The Surat split had a lasting effect on the nationalists in Tamil Nadu. Government repression drove the extremists into underground or into exile in the French enclave of Pondicherry. Among the exiles there were Subramanya Bharathi, Neelakanta Bramachari and V.V.S. Aiyer and others. Each of them represented three different methods of political protest namely extremism, revolution and terrorism. Yet all of them had the single goal of, driving out the British from India. Russian revolution of 1905 also inspired several youngsters in Tamil Nadu to take up extremism as a political weapon.

During the conflict between the extremists and the moderates, the latter kept the Madras Congress firmly in their grip and after the Surat split of 1907 also the moderates managed to keep away the extremists out of the Provincial Congress and virtually killed the Congress organisation in the districts, which they thought will disturb the political calm in which their influence was so secure. And between 1907-1915 the extremists action was banished by government repression.
During the First World War, the moderates considered that the time was ripe enough to press for a further devolution of power. Meanwhile, Home Rule League of Annie Besant emerged and attracted everyone. The moderates of Tamil Nadu decided to continue their assistance to government in the hope that they could be able to transform their undeniable influence into more formal power. Also, moderates allied with Annie Besant and used the Home Rule League as their vehicle. The extremists of Tamil Nadu, who were also called as nationalists, at first, were willing to co-operate with Besant's Home Rule Movement. She was instrumental in persuading the moderates to allow the return of the extremists to the Congress in 1915 nearly eight years after their expulsion in 1907. Thus, for a brief time in 1916 the Home Rule Movement united all the political factions of Madras. However, this unity did not survive after 1918.

By the end of that year the Tamil extremists no longer needed Besant and began to assert their separate identity. Their immediate objective was to capture the Madras Pradesh Congress Committee. Beyond that they wanted to use Congress as a base for capturing Madras Legislature under the Montague-Chelmsford Reforms. Having been in the wilderness after their expulsion from the Congress Committee in 1907, the extremists realised the mastery of the organisation as the pre-requisite to nationalist leadership and proposed responsive co-operation.
The extremists showed their difference with the moderates during the Rowiatt Satyagraha. The conflict for the control of Madras PCC reached its climax in March 1919 between the Extremists and the Home Rulers. Besant resigned along with her faction namely G.A. Natesan, B.P. Wadia, C.P. Ramaswami Iyer and L.A. Govinda-raghava Iyer who had been the PCC President of the Moderates. Ten days later extremists took over the posts in the Madras PCC, Kasturi Ranga Iyengar became the President; T. Rangachari and T.V. Venkatarama Iyer became Vice-Presidents, while Sathyamurthy was made as the Secretary. These extremists were not interested in stimulating mass unrest. For them the Satyagraha was convenient gesture against the Raj, coinciding with the take over of the PCC. Extremists stopped their activities and began to prepare for the first elections to the legislature in November 1920.

A Satyagraha Association was formed by Gandhi in 1919 in Madras. Kasturi Ranga Iyengar, Rajaji, Thiru. Vi. Ka, Adi Narayana Chetti, Rangaswami Iyengar, Sathyamurthy were important among those who worked for the Satyagraha and defended Gandhi.

At the end of 1919 the extremists shed their old name and in common with Tilakites elsewhere, adopted the name 'Nationalists'. As the moderates had public reputation than the extremists, they launched a new political organisation in November 1919 and named it as 'Nationalists Party' with C. Vijayaraghavachari of Salem, as President and K.V. Rangaswami Iyengar of Tiruchirapally.
as one of the Vice-Presidents and started the election campaign.15 By April 1920 the nationalists seemed to be firmly in command but their ascendency was to be short lived.

A complete boycott of the legislatures had become, by August 1920, the central item of Gandhi’s Non-Cooperation Programme and it was over the council boycott, more than any other aspect of Non-Cooperation, that the Madras nationalists differed from Gandhi. They wanted to follow a more restricted agitation focussing on swadeshi and the boycott of foreign goods.

The first clash between the Gandhilites and Nationalists was seen at the Madras Provincial Conference held at Tirunelveli during 21-23 June 1920, when Rajaji moved an additional resolution calling for Non-Cooperation, which was not agreed by the nationalists and even S. Srinivesa Iyengar objected it.16 But the resolution was passed with the help of Khilafat Muslims and Youth League. The Youth League group included K. Santhanam, K. Subramaniam, N.S. Varadachari, K.V. Rajagopalan, S. Ramanathan, G.V. Krupanidhi and others.17

Undeterred, the nationalists refused to be bound by the Tirunelveli resolution and continued their election campaign for capture of legislatures. The PCC rejected the Tirunelveli resolution and approved the Non-Cooperation resolution, but without council boycott. The next round of the struggle between Gandhilites and
Nationalists took place outside the regional area. Rajaji saw it that Non-Cooperators were elected as the Madras delegates to the Calcutta Special Congress in September 1920 and was successful in making INC to adopt Gandhi's Non-Cooperation strategy.\(^\text{18}\)

In the six weeks following the Special Congress three surprising changes transformed the leadership of the Congress in Tamil Nadu. Firstly, many of the Nationalists withdrew as candidates for the Provincial and Central Legislatures, including Vijaya Raghavachari and A. Rangaswami Iyengar. This was accompanied by the resignation of nine leading nationalists from the Pradesh Executive Committee including Kasturi Ranga Iyengar, who was the President.\(^\text{19}\) Finally, on 19th October the vacancies on the committee were filled without opposition by the associates of Rajaji and T.V. Venkatarama Iyer was elected as the President\(^\text{20}\), thus facilitating the Madras PCC to come under the grip of Gandhijites.

\textit{1920-1930:}

In the period of 1916-1922, the eruption of new forces in the field of provincial politics, the indecision of the old Congress leaders over the new legislatures, the arrival of Gandhi on the All-India stage and the explosion of Non-Cooperation agitation equipped the Provincial Congress with new aims, new policies and new leaders. Rajaji led a batch of leaders from mofussil Tamilnadu - P. Varadarajulu Naidu (Salem), T. Adinarayana Chetti (Coimbatore),
E.V. Ramaswamy Naicker (Erode), Dr. T.S.S. Rajan (Tiruchirapally) and T.V. Kaliyanasundaram Mudaliar (Madras) - to control the newly established Madras Provincial Congress. Meanwhile, a new constitution was drafted for the INC which included an All-India Working Committee capable of keeping the Congress active throughout the year, a scheme for membership with a four-anna subscription and a hierarchy of committees from the All India Working Committee down to province, district, taluk and village. But, while these important years grafted new elements on to the Congress, the old leaders were not entirely superseded. Many of the old leaders who had apparently been pushed aside by the Gandhian agitation returned to the Congress in the early 1920’s.

By November 1921, Congress was re-organised at the centre and as a result PCC’s were re-organised based on linguistic regions. The Madras Provincial Congress was divided into four linguistic committees and Tamil Nadu Congress Committee came into existence (TNCC). This re-organisation of the Congress was one among the several issues over which the Gandhiites and Nationalists clashed during 1921. The nationalists wanted to keep the Congress open to those who disagreed with Gandhi’s ideas and tactics and also wanted to guarantee for themselves a position in the national leadership through representation in AICC and PCC on the basis of interests, but this was not accepted. In September 1921, the Gandhiites further strengthened their position by shifting the PCC head-
quarters from Madras to Tiruchirapally.\textsuperscript{23} This was done deliberately to control the influence of the nationalists in offices and in meetings. The TNCC elections in November 1921, reflected the power shift from Madras to the mofussil areas, and from the nationalists to the Gandhites. Rajaji, E.V.R. and T.S.S. Rajan began to control the Congress from now onwards. However, the proportion of the non-Brahmins in PCC was high in comparison to the composition of the previous PCC's.\textsuperscript{24} Inspite of this, Gandhi's Non-Co-operation did not attract many sections of the Tamil population.\textsuperscript{25}

By 1922, the Gandhian Non-Cooperation Movement crumbled and its organisational weaknesses became apparent. Consequently an alternative policy emerged. The protagonists of this policy were called as 'Swarajists'. The core of the Swarajists in the province was the Madras City Nationalists, the group which remained reluctant about the idea of Non-Cooperation and took the first opportunity to guide the Congress back towards an electoral strategy. In mid-1922, the Madras Nationalists joined with other dissidents to lay the foundation of All India Swaraj Party, but C.R. Das and Motilal Nehru pushed the southerners into the background.\textsuperscript{26}

Sathyanurthy was doing an excellent job of courting all the dissidents in Madras politics. C.R. Reddy, T.A. Ramalinga Chetty and A. Ramaswamy Mudaliar of Justice Party were brought under the tent of Swarajists, due to their quarrel with the Raja of Panagal over issues of patronage.\textsuperscript{27} He also picked up several
refugees from the Non-Cooperation Congressmen like the Salem clan-head P. Varadarajulu Naidu and Andhra leaders like Konda Venkatapyya, A. Kaleshwara Rao and others.

The Swarajist cause attracted these men because it promised to provide a vehicle for displacing the justicites. Srinivasa Iyengar and Thiru. Vl. Ka. were trying to bring consensus between the Gandhiites and the Swarajists. Srinivasa Iyengar was a staunch Non-Cooperator but Thiru. Vl. Ka. though he did not support Non-Cooperation, disliked the division within Congress as Non-Co-operators and Swarajists. The swarajists, by 1924, had won the control of the Congress organisation and had attracted a variety of political disidents to their new organisation.28

By using party funds for anti-Swarajist propaganda, and by controlling the party patronage Rajaji struggled desperately to maintain his regional position. In August 1924, the constitution of the TNCC was changed for the third time in four years to minimize the avenues of participation by the Swarajists. But between 1922 and 1925 Rajaji's position was being steadily eroded. The Muslims who supported him in 1920 deserted the Congress in 1922, with the feeling that they had gained nothing by the alliance. From 1922 a rift opened up among the Gandhiites - between Rajaji who was supported by a few Brahmin activists and a nebulous group of dissatisfied non-Brahmin congressmen led by E.V.R. and S. Ramanathan.29 At first their grievance was that Rajaji had tricked
them capitulating to the Swarajists. Secondly their protest pertained to the Kakinada Congress in which Rajaji did not let them to argue their case and also endorsed the Delhi agreement without their consent. 30

In November 1924, TNCC met at Thiruvannamalai which was presided by E.V.R., in order mainly to decide about the council entry. To bring co-operation among the factions, the Non-Cooperation Movement was suspended and Non-Cooperation within the councils was accepted. 31 Boredom with Khadi disenchantment, with Rajaji and a hankering for dramatic new campaign led E.V.R. to join Satyagraha begun at Vaikom in Travancore in 1924, which was successful in 1924 and brought fame to E.V.R. Meanwhile, Rajaji was suspected of a covert hostility to the advancement of the untouchables. The rift quickly widened in 1925. Varadarajulu Naidu, TNCC President, discovered that Brahmin, non-Brahmin pupils were expected to dine separately at the Shermadevi Gurukulam, a national school run by V.V.S. Iyer and condemned its discrimination. The revelation produced an outburst of anti-Brahminism from P. Varadarajulu Naidu which was supported by E.V.R. and Thiru. Vl. Ka. Rajaji and six of his associates resigned from the TNCC and this marked the final withdrawal of Gandhiiites from the leadership of TNCC. The Swarajists took over and S. Srinivasa Iyengar was elected as the President at the end of 1925. 32
In Tamil Nadu, because of Rajaji's rearguard action, the Swarajists could gain ground only gradually. Denied of access to the TNCC's resources until 1925, they entered the 1923 elections short of funds, with few candidates and little organisational structure. As late as July 1923 only Rangaswami Iyengar and Sathyamurthy had declared themselves as Swarajists and no more than a dozen of Tamil Swarajists contested seats for the Madras Legislature in that year. They won five out of six Assembly seats, but they could not rival the Justice Party's influence in the local bodies.33

The Tamil Swarajists in March 1924 entered an alliance with other opposition MLA's to form the United Nationalist Party. Its leader was C.V.S. Narasimharaju and its executive committee included only one Brahmin namely Sathyamurthy amidst a cluster of non-Brahmin dissidents like T.A. Ramalingam Chetti (Coimbatore), C. Ramalinga Reddi (Chittoor), C. Natesa Mudaliar (Madras) and P. Subbaroyen (Salem).34 It was not merely the numerical weakness of the Swarajists that was responsible for their alliance with the dissident opposition. Ideologically also they were interested less in the destruction of dyarchy than seeking to work it to their advantage. By denouncing Non-Cooperation as an aberration and calling for a return to normal political work, 'the Tamil Swarajists thus laid themselves open to criticism from Congressmen who feared a reversion to the politics of Ghokale and Srinivasa Sastri'.
In November 1925 TNCC met at Kancheepuram presided by Thiru. Vi. Ka. Two recommendations were made here: (1) Khadder programme was made compulsory; and (2) Congress was asked to work to enter the councils so that there will be no need for the Swarajist Party within the Congress. The second proposal was opposed by E.V.R., S. Ramanathan and Rajaji. Finally the proposal was rejected. But E.V.R. and S. Ramanathan made another proposal which was concerned with the requisition of communal representation in the councils. This proposal was also rejected by Thiru. Vi. Ka. who maintained that this issue should be decided only by the Swarajists and not by the Congress. Confusion arose and immediately E.V.R., S. Ramanathan, Surendranath Arya and Chakarai Chettiar made a walk out. Srinivasa Iyengar came forward to assuage the feelings of the Swarajists who were wounded by the rejection of the second proposal. However, E.V.R. disliked the re-entry of the Swarajists into the Congress and was also against council entry. He left the Congress after the Kancheepuram Conference and started working against Congress. Thiru. Vi. Ka. also resigned from the working committee when he came to understand that the Non-Co-operator who was expected to enter council to wreck it, will be required to extend co-operation in forming the Ministry. 35 Though Srinivasa Iyengar tried to persuade him, he was not successful. When Non-Co-operation began, Rajaji, P. Varadarajulu Naidu, Thiru. Vi. Ka. and T.S.S. Rajan were all united and worked with high discipline. P. Varadarajulu Naidu left this faction in 1924, Thiru.
Vi. Ka. left it during Thiruvannamalai Conference and E.V.R. left it after the Kancheepuram Conference and the strength of the Conference was reduced.

Congress of Tamil Nadu wanted to form the Ministry immediately after the 1926 elections and did so, accepting P. Subbaroyan as Chief Minister of the Independent Ministry. This was to prevent the Justice Party returning to office. By these tactics the Ministry was formed but cracks appeared in the Congress facade. One breakaway group headed by Muthia Mudaliar of Tanjore, wanted to dismiss the caretaker Ministry and take office regardless of the Congress ban; another group, consisting mainly of Telugu and Malayalam MLC’s who were resentful of the control exercised by Srinivasa Iyengar and his Tamil Associates, wanted the Ministry be defeated in the hope that the Justicites would not form a new Ministry leading to a constitutional crisis. The main attack on the party’s tactics came, however, from Prakasam, the Congress leader of Telugu areas. 36

After the defeat of the Justice Party, many of its leaders like Kumaraswamy Raja, Ramaswamy Mudaliar, Patro, Thanikachalam Chetty and others wanted to join Congress. But the Tamil Nadu Congress did not agree to it and the unity proposal was a failure. With the help of the Justicites it would have been easy to wreck the council but the good chance was missed. 37 S. Srinivasa Iyengar
left Congress in 1929 after the Lahore Session of INC, disagreeing with the national leadership on several issues. The Congress again accepted Non-Cooperation in 1929 and again Rajaji gained an upper-hand.

1930-1947:

At the Lahore Session of the INC the decision to launch Civil Disobedience Movement was received with mixed enthusiasm by most of the Tamil Congressmen, especially by the former United Nationalists. Five Congress MLCs refused to resign in Madras. Though Venkatachalam Chetti in the Legislative Council and R.K. Shanmugam Chetti in the Assembly resigned, they successfully recontested as independents. Sathyamurthy canvassed for a new Nationalist Party for the continuation of work in Madras Legislature, but later dropped the idea and resigned from the Assembly, with the intention that the pro-changers would have to be quiet and wait for the chance, to lead the Congress back to constitutional action.38

Reflecting upon their lessons of the protracted struggle for control of the TNCC in 1922-1925, the leading Swarajists quickly surrendered their places in the TNCC in 1930. Following S. Srinivasa Iyengar, his successor Muthuranga Mudaliar also resigned from TNCC in March 1930, having struggled half-heartedly to resist the boycott of Madras Legislature. When Rajaji returned in April 1930 to lead the TNCC, the party headquarters which was functioning
in Madras City since 1925, was shifted back to Tiruchirapally. T.S.S. Rajan resumed his old post as Party Secretary. 39

Authorised by AICC and TNCC to direct the Salt Satyagraha in Tamil Nadu, Rajaji was cautious in approaching the issue and started the Vedaranyam March in mid-April 1930. In the initial stages of the Satyagraha, Rajaji miscalculated that Satyagraha in Tamil Nadu would gain momentum only gradually. However, even before he reached Vedaranyam the turn of events in Madras showed that the agitation had sufficient popular support. But it was to be noted that the support for the Satyagraha came mainly from Telugus like T. Prakasam and K. Nageswara Rao and others. 40

The Swarajists did not have a long term commitment to Civil Disobedience. Their faith in constitutional action was unshaken, but they saw the political gains, of the agitation at that juncture, They, like Rajaji, believed that Civil Disobedience could influence the outcome of the constitutional discussion in London. 41 This was in marked contrast with the nationalist's basic hostility to Non-Cooperation in 1920-1922.

A group of activists, namely Kamaraj Nadar of Virudhunagar, N. Annamalai Pillai of Thiruvannamalai and Srinivasa Varada Iyengar of Madurai district, were drawn into the Congress between 1918 and 1922. They distrusted Rajaji and after 1922 they were alienated by his intellectualism. They began to follow Subramania
Siva and held many unofficial Satyagrahas. After the displacement of the Swarajists in April 1930, Kamaraj-Annadalai Pillai group tried to gain control of the TNCC by proposing that Rajaji should concentrate more on the Vedaranya Satyagraha, thus leaving organisational issues and routine work of the office of the President to somebody else. Absence of a competent leader among them, who could rival Rajaji, made them line up with Sathyamurthy. Ever since 1920, Rajaji and Sathyamurthy have represented two different, strategic views in the Tamil Nadu Congress (TNC). Rajaji, the Gandhian, had led the agitation, Khadder organisations and the Congress constructive work programme and had shunned involvement in local and provincial government; Sathyamurthy the Swarajist, had co-operated reluctantly in the Gandhian agitations and had consistently urged that Congress should invade the governmental framework. The continuing battle for leadership between these two and their respective followings had been essentially a battle over Congress policy.

As the influential leaders like Srinivasa Iyengar, B.V.R., P. Varadarajulu Naidu and Thiru. Vi. Ka. had deserted Congress by 1930, only Rajaji and Sathyamurthy remained to contest for the leadership. Thus the struggle between their factions started in 1931 during the TNCC presidential elections. Both intended to become influential in TNC. Rajaji was supported by the workers of Khadder shops and the anti-Swarajists. Generally the rich class supported Rajaji and it was financially strong. On the other hand Sathyamurthy, backed by Kamaraj, had the support of the ordinary Congress workers.
He also gained the organisational support of TNCC which met at Madurai, to elect the President. Initially both were to contest but on a compromise, that Rajaji be made the President and Sathya- murthy the Vice-President, both of them withdrew. Accordingly Rajaji was made the President and when it was his turn to propose Sathya murthy for the office of the Vice-President, Rajaji's faction proposed Sardar Vedarathinam. The other faction was shocked by this action and they proposed Annamalai Pillai (Thiruvannamalai) for Vice-Presidentship. Rajaji, realising the strength of the other faction, again made a compromise and made the other faction to withdraw the proposals and elected Sathya murthy himself as the Vice-President. As the Sathya murthy's faction enjoyed the strong support of the organisation, it was able to capture the working committee of TNCC also. Kamaraj helped Sathya murthy in all these and he became one of working committee members for the first time and he was also made as an AICC member and in this way a new non-Brahmin element was injected into the party leadership. Largely it was the non-Brahmin forces which stood up the 1930-1931 problems of Non-Cooperation Movement.

Unlike the bitter debate over the strategies in mid-1920's there was a general consensus in the TNCC in mid-1930's. Constitutionalism was the only course possible, and there was no conflict between factions with regard to the ideological basis of the movement, whether to enter councils or not. Sathya murthy launched the Madras
Swaraj Party in October 1933. His supporters included the former Swarajists like, Bhashyam Iyengar and Muthuranga Mudaliar, allies from Kamaraj-Annamalai Pillai group and several of Rajaji's Brahmin associates. A broad consensus amidst them on a parliamentary programme afforded an internal unity which was absent in the 1920's. The Rajaji faction represented the rightists or perhaps the establishment and Satyamurthy, Kamaraj, Socialist and Communist factions together represented an agglomeration of interests.

When AICC met at Kanchi in May 1934, it approved the abandonment of Civil Disobedience and the adoption of a constitutional programme. Rajaji rapidly established himself as one of the leading spokesmen, as the rightists also wanted to enter the council, for they were tired of prison life and wanted to gain political influence through power. Another reason for this course of action was their aversion to the growth of the leftwing movements in India such as the CSP and the CPI. However, Rajaji maintained unity with the socialists and communists of Tamil Nadu. The core of the socialists in Tamil Nadu centered around S.R. Subramaniam, P.S. Chinnadurai, S. Muthulakshmi Reddy and A. Nallasivam. The notable communists were P. Ramamurthy, M. Kalyanasundaram, M.R. Venkataraman and others.

Disagreement between Rajaji and Sathyamurthy extended to the control of local boards also. Except in mid-1920's when the Swarajists attempted to control the Madras Corporation and
the Municipal Councils, the TNC had not made any systematic efforts to capture local boards. Rajaji opposed the involvement of Congressmen in local government in the belief that it would distract them from agitational and constructive programme and would entail enormous labour and expense. 47 But Sathyamurthy, who succeeded Rajaji as TNCC President in May 1935, along with a majority of party leaders, activists and sympathizers, believed that by ousting the supporters of the Justice Party from the local boards, the Congress would undercut its rivals and command patronage for itself. Party activists, especially those from the Kamaraj-Annamalai Pillai group, were eager that the Congress should go into positions of power and profit therefrom.

So in May 1935, Sathyamurthy announced the formation of TNC Civic Board to select party candidates for local elections. Its programme pledged, to work for the removal of corruption, the promotion of swadeshi goods, the improvement of local education and medical facilities; the extension of water supplies and roads and the voting of addresses to nationalist leaders. The composition of the Board, however, reflected the co-operation between Congress factions. Sathyamurthy, Kumaraswamy Raja and Baktavatsalam were the office-bearers of the Board while former Swarajists, local activists and associates of Rajaji were its members. 48

To gain support for their factions each one used their own tactics. Rajaji was deeply engaged in the Harijan Movement
and brought the Harijans into the Congress. Sathyamurthy took up the case of the land owners and cultivators who were fiercely hit by the falling of crop prices during the depression and he campaigned for the reduction of the land revenue rates and earned the support of the land owning class.

When Sathyamurthy was made the President of TNCC in 1935, it aroused considerable hostility within the party especially amidst the Swarajist colleagues like Muthuranga Mudaliar and Bashyam Iyengar. Still, Rajaji left Sathyamurthy to become the President because the latter can control Kamaraj-Annalalai Pillai group easily. Rajaji manipulated to place himself as the link between Gandhian High Command and Tamil Nadu Congress on the one hand and at the same time turned the rival into a friend on the other, by his superior tactics. Thus Rajaji controlled Tamil Nadu Congress Committee to a remarkable extent.

Sathyamurthy master-minded the Legislative Assembly and the District Board campaigns in 1934-1936 and thus for the moment dominated the Congress organisation in Tamil Nadu. However, at the TNCC meeting in January 1936 at Karaikudi, his leadership was challenged by C.N. Muthuranga Mudaliar, who was a follower of Sathyamurthy and lieutenant of Srinivasa Iyengar. Sathyamurthy defeated him. But by the time of the next contest in December of the same year, the political temperature was far too higher and Sathyamurthy was accused of rigging his success in January.
Sathyamurthy had, it was alleged, wooed for supporters with promises of patronage from the Madras Corporation, where he had wielded enormous influence; and with complimentary tickets to the Congress Exhibition and the Musical Festival both of which Sathyamurthy had recently helped to be staged in Madras. In December, nevertheless, Muthuranga Mudaliar defeated Sathyamurthy.

By 1936, many of the defectors returned to Congress. Liberals and a few united nationalists like Subbaroyen joined the Congress. Although Sathyamurthy was alarmed that their entry might lessen his own chances of office, Rajaji welcomed them as he thought it would further strengthen his hands as well as the Congress Party. Another group of men like S. Ramanathan and P. Jeevanandam, returned to Congress in 1935, after E.V.R's arrest for his seditious articles. In 1936, P. Varadarajulu Naidu also entered Congress after his ten years of association with the Justice Party.

The Government of India Act of 1935 bestowed Provincial Autonomy in Madras Presidency. Dyarchy was abolished and provincial government was vested in a Council of Ministers responsible to a bi-cameral legislature. The Governor remained as a titular head. The franchise was considerably widened. Indian National Congress decided in July 1936 to contest the election. Sathyamurthy had of course been campaigning for a return to the constitutional strategy ever since it was abandoned in 1929. By 1936, even the
steaunbch leaders of Civil Disobedience Movement in Andhra, like Prakasam and Kaleshwar Rao, were firmly in favour of contesting the elections. While Rajaji stated, "My own view is that .... as much benefit should be wrung out of the councils as possible for strengthening the prestige and position of the Congress". Prakasam and Sambamoorthy led the election campaign in Andhra and the election committee which toured Tamil Nadu consisted of prominent men like Sathyamurthy, P.S. Kumaraswamy Raja, C.N. Muthuranga Mudaliar, Avinashilingam Chettiar, O.P. Ramaswami Reddiar and others. 50

Sathyamurthy still hoped to lead the Congress Party in the Provincial Legislative Assembly after the 1937 elections and he secured the Congress nomination for the only 'pocket borough', viz., the University Constituency. Meanwhile, Thiru. Vi. Ka. agitated against the growing corruption in the TNC elections and intended to start a separate Tamil Nadu Congress as a rival to the existing one. Rajaji convinced Thiru. Vi. Ka. and stopped his action and as a measure to cleanse the organisation he made Sathyamurthy to withdraw his nomination and he himself stood in that constituency and had won. Sathyamurthy had to withdraw his nomination because of an assurance extended to him that he will be made a Minister in the ensuing Ministry, subsequent to his nomination of the upper house. But these words were not kept and T.S.S. Rajan was nominated to the upper house in the place promised to Sathyamurthy and was also given Ministership. Sathya-
murthy was left high and dry and the struggle for power between the factions reached a point of no return.

In 1937, Congress obtained the majority and formed the Ministry with Rajaji as the Chief Minister. He also took hold of the Presidentship of the TNCC. For the next two years Sathyamurthy contested in vain for the office of the President of TNCC. Rajaji, who knew the growth of the sentiment of non-Brahminism in Congress, made C.N. Muthuranga Mudaliar to oppose Sathyamurthy in the 1938 elections and had split the votes of the non-Brahmins, Sathyamurthy was again defeated. Similarly in 1939, Rajaji's candidate O.P. Ramaswami Reddiar was made to contest and he also defeated Sathyamurthy. The Brahmin, non-Brahmin conflict which developed after the exist of E.V.R., was exploited fully by Rajaji while nominating a candidate for the TNCC Presidentship.

In the 1940 TNCC Presidential elections, instead of personally contesting, Sathyamurthy made his deputy, Kamaraj to contest, while Rajaji made C.P. Subbiah to be his nominee. The election was highly competitive and Kamaraj had won by a margin of three votes (103 to 100). Sathyamurthy himself became the Secretary thus recapturing the Tamil Nadu Congress Organisation.51

Thus factionalism reigned supreme in the first phase of the Congress. The moderates and extremists vied with each other in their approaches to national freedom. Perhaps it was the best
phase of the Congress in which uni-factionalism worked hard to drive its point home - but within the constitutional tent of the Congress.

In second phase of factionalism also, uni-factionalism was dominant in TNCC, for the Swarajists were the official Congress throughout. The Gandhites, however, remained within the Congress to clinch their political ideology. The Gandhites brought out new recruitment and organisational viability to the Congress in ample measure. As years progressed, higher castes and the better educated ones gravitated towards Rajaji and participated in his struggles against the Swarajists. Due to the energies of E.V.R., the Brahamnon-Brahmin conflict with the Congress gained ascendancy and the Self-respect Movement of E.V.R. was a by-product of the factional conflict in TNC.

In the third phase, multi-factionalism appeared in the Congress for the first time in the 1930's. Social and economic aspirations, personality clashes, caste consciousness and organisational competitions were the reasons for the development of factionalism during the period. It led to the various activities, some constitutional and peaceful and others wholly violent. But in spite of multi-factionalism in the Tamil Nadu Congress it was united together by the common enemy - the British. TNC emerged from the Civil Disobedience internally more cohesive and organisationally more powerful than it had been during the previous decades.
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