



## INTEGRATION OF TAMIL REGIONS AND THE DAWN OF TAMIL NADU

**M. Rajaveni**

**Full-Time Ph.D. Research Scholar, Department of History, Presidency College (Autonomous),  
Affiliated to the University of Madras, Chennai, Tamil Nadu State.**

### ABSTRACT:

*A number of movements emerged in the Twentieth Century Tamil Nadu. Among them two prominent movements were the Nationalist Movement and the Dravidian Movement which covered the masses of the Tamil Nadu. Both gave importance to the sentiments of the linguistic peoples. The Dravidian Movement gave priority to Dravidian nationalism and Tamil renaissance. E.V.Ramasami, the leader of the Dravidian Movement demanded the Dravidia Nadu and when the demand was not backed by the Telugu leaders, E.V.Ramasami and C.N.Annadurai brought the issue within Tamil Nadu. For them, DravidaNadu, the region of Tamils. Thus a province was sought for the Tamils when the Draavida Nadu deamnd was given up in the Independent India. The Tamil leaders and scholars, continously insisted the ruling politicians the name of the Tamil Nadu State in lieu of the Madras State.*



**KEYWORDS:** Tamil Nadu, Madras State, Congress, E.V.Ramasami, Gandhi, Sriramalu, Andhra, India.

### INTRODUCTION

The States Reorganization of 1956 in India represented the culmination of a widespread movement to break the widely presidencies (provinces) formed by the British in India and create small and homogeneous territorial units in their place. In order to make the nationalist movement strong and reach the masses, which until then comprised the microscopic minority of the elites, Gandhi and Tilak encouraged regional languages. It was the Indian National Congress that knowingly or unknowingly paved the way for the creation of linguistic provinces. In 1917 Andhra and Sindh became separate Congress provinces. During the 1920 annual session of the Congress Party in Nagpur, the party decided to apply the principle of the linguistic redistribution of states throughout India. To implement the objectives, the All India Conference appointed a Committee in 1928 to draft a constitution for the redistribution of the provinces on a more logical basis. <sup>1</sup> The Conference Committee advised that the redistribution must be partly geographical and partly economic and financial, but that the main consideration must necessarily be the will of the people and the linguistic unity of the territories involved.

The question of the reorganization of states acquired some importance after the achievement of Independence. As Nehru, Patel and other leaders dominated the Indian political scene, a controversy had developed over whether it should be in the interest of national integration. As a result, the Indian

Government had taken steps to rectify the inherent contradictions. Therefore, the linguistic principle had to give way to other important considerations such as national unity, national integration, geographical contiguity, financial position without burdening the central government, administrative convenience and, above all, the wishes of the people being the main democratic considerations.<sup>2</sup>

In the Reorganization of States in India, as regards the Madras State, the unrest has focused mainly on two regions, namely the border areas of Travancore and Andhra. The border area of Karnataka was not a problem area. After independence, the principle of linguistic reorganization was applied for the first time in the case of Andhra. The Indian National Congress, having already accepted the linguistic principle in the Reorganization of States and reaffirmed in the first electoral manifesto of 1952, adopted a policy of caution and delay rather than haste in view of national integration, economic regeneration, consolidation newly acquired independence, external and internal threats.<sup>3</sup>

In December 1952, PottiSriramulu, following Gandhi's traditional passive resistance technique, embarked on a deadly fast in support of the demand for a separate state for Andhra.<sup>4</sup> Sriramulu fasted for 58 days. Such was the intensity of the sentiments aroused by Sriramulu's death that Congress finally had to yield to the wishes of the people of Andhra, and in 1953 a separate Andhra state was created.<sup>5</sup> It intensified the demands for reorganisation of states across the country on linguistic basis.<sup>6</sup>

To resolve border disputes, the State Reorganization Commission had called on states to resolve the issue peacefully and amicably by establishing zone councils. But that did not work between the governments of the states of Andhra and Madras.<sup>7</sup> The border dispute between Andhra and Madras had gained vigorous momentum. Madras, under the leadership of M.P. Sivagnanam, demanded the district of Chittoor which included Tirupati and Tiruttani, all in the district of Chittoor, where it was claimed that most of the people were Tamil-speaking, in addition to the fact that those places were connected to the Madras State by history, tradition, sentiment, culture, geography and other factors.<sup>8</sup>

In the meanwhile, Andhra demanded Madras City pointing out that it did not have such a city in Andhra as its capital. Despite long and serious fighting, Andhra won the Chittoor District by excluding Tiruttani. Tamil leaders felt a great injustice had been done to them, while the Central Government wanted peace in the nascent republic.<sup>9</sup>

Similarly, in the south, the Madras Government claimed the Taluk of Thovala, Agasteeswaram, Kalkulam, Vilavancode, Shencottai, Devikulam, Peermedu, and Neyyatinkara in Travancore- Cochin State, which had a predominantly Tamil-speaking population. The head of this agitation was A. Nesamony, president of the T.T.N.C.<sup>10</sup> He fought for the integration of Tamils in Travancore. M.P. Sivagnanam of 'TamilarasuKazhagam' extended his moral support to Nesamony. The Madras Government was very disappointed with the loss of Devikulam and Peermedu. Due to the peace policy of the central government and the mediation of the then Chief Minister of the State of Madras, K. Karnaraj, who with a friendly and the nationalist perspective said, "Be it forests or hills, everything is in India," the border dispute between the States of Madras and Travancore ended with the formation of the Kanyakumari District, which consists of the four southern taluks of Travancore -Cochin State, namely Vilavancode, Kalkulam, Agasteeswaram and Thovalai, and its integration with the Madras State which also got included Shencottah taluk in the Tirunelveli District.<sup>11</sup>

As for the state border of Karnataka, it did not pose serious problems. It cannot be considered a border dispute but a mere adjustment. Although Karnataka had demanded Nilgiris of the Madras State to obtain close geographical contiguity with Hosur, in the end after the discussion, Hosur remained in the Madras State.<sup>12</sup>

Although not so well established at the time of Independence, the Indian states were reorganized according to the linguistic principle. Although such a reorganization was often not favored by government leaders, they were eventually forced to divide the country on a linguistic basis. Leaders feared that the reorganization of states on the basis of language could affect the unity and well-being of India. But it should be remembered that M.P. Sivagnanam categorically stated that loyalty to the region and the center simultaneously was entirely possible and that the linguistic approach must not endanger the unity and stability of India.<sup>13</sup>

A language group has an almost distinct culture with its own unique literature, history, tradition and feelings that are necessary for personal development. In most cases, state and language borders have coincided and unity and diversity are the cornerstones of Indian culture.<sup>14</sup>

Towards the end of 1956, the Indian parliament passed an Act stipulating that India would have fourteen states and seven union territories. This represented the fulfillment of a long cherished dream.<sup>15</sup>

Regarding the name of the Madras State, Tamil leaders such as M.P. Sivagnanam had strongly appealed to change its name to Tamil Nadu since Andhra's formation in 1953. But the Madras State Ministry shelved the request because it feared it would give the impression of limited linguistic trend. K. Kamaraj's ministry gave it the name Tamizh Nadu so that it could also be called Madras State. In 1967 during the D.M.K. regime, the Chief Minister C.N. Annadurai renamed the State of Madras as Tamil Nadu.<sup>16</sup> The upheaval represented the emancipation of Tamils from socio-political subordination in several areas.

To conclude, the Tamils spread all over the world and spread their culture in the ancient period. The Tamil region in ancient period was called Tamil Country. David Arnold, called the Tamil Country a 'nation within a nation'. Indeed, it had a vast territorial area. With the spread of the Vijayanagar Empire, the Telugus migrated into the Tamil Country. At that times, the area of the Tamil Country was from Tirupati in the north to Kanyakumari in the South. The linguistic feelings well developed in the first half of the Twentieth Century. The Tamil Nadu Congress Committee was constituted on linguistic lines. The newspaper, 'Tamil Nadu' was started by Varadarajulu Naidu on linguistic lines. Some of the Tamil leaders like M.P.Sivagnanam and S.P. Adithan started organisations demanding the name of the Tamil Nadu State in the place of the Madras State. Due to the continuous agitations in the southern and northern borders of the Madras State, ultimately the Tamil Nadu State was formed with the integration of the Tamil regions.

#### END NOTES

1. *States Reorganisation Report*, New Delhi: 1995, p.1.
2. *Report on Indian Constitutional Reforms*, Calcutta: 1918, para 39.
3. Phadke, Y.D., *Politics and Language*, Bombay: 1979, p.1.
4. *The Hindu*, 14 January 1953, p.4.
5. G.O. No.3315, Public (Partition) Department, 30 December 1953, p.5
6. Ramgopal, *Linguistic Affairs of India*, New Delhi: 1996, p.63
7. *States Reorganisation Report*, 1995, pp.2 and 17-18.
8. *Report on Indian Constitutional Reforms* op.cit. Para 39.
9. *The Hindu*, 11 November 1955, p.5
10. *Sengol*, 21 October 1956, p.1
11. *Dinamalar*, 25 April 1954, p.5
12. *Viduthalai*, 13 December 1954, p.1.
13. *The Hindu*, 10 November 1956, p.1.
14. John, Maria John, 'The Formation of the State of Tamil Nadu' in *Proceedings Volume of the Twenty Seventh Annual Session of the South Indian History Congress*, Rajapalayam : South Indian History Congress, 2007, pp.201-204
15. *The Hindu*, 9 January 1953, p.2.
16. John, Maria, B., *Formation of the State of Tamil Nadu*, Nagarcoil: Ajith Publications, 2006 p.196.