



STRUGGLE FOR THE FORMATION OF TAMIL NADU

Dr. R. Abbas

Assistant Professor of History , Annamalai University ,
(Deputed to M.V. Muthiah Government Arts
College for Women, Dindigul)



ABSTRACT:

Tamil Nadu is one of the 29 states of India. Tamil Nadu is the eleventh largest Indian state by area and the sixth largest state by population. Chennai is now well-entrenched as the capital of the modern state of Tamil Nadu. In the mid-20th century the pre-eminent place of Madras as the Tamil capital came to be challenged by Telugu politicians. "Madras Namade" ("Madras is Ours") captures this controversy in an alliterative Telugu slogan. Tamil Arasu Kazhagam was identified with the Tamils and continuously struggled for the socio-political, economic and culture rights of the Tamils. Particularly, its struggle for renaming the state and call for state autonomy not only promoted the rights of the Tamils but also their culture consciousness. The Tamil Arasu Kazhagam was the first political party to give lead to the movement for renaming the state of Madras as "Tamil Nadu" The protracted struggle at the northern and southern boundaries were the two important agitational programmes of the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam. The border struggle of the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam was the another dimension of Tamil nationalism embedded in Tamil literature and its main aim was to restore the border areas. In the uphill struggle for providing an environment for the growth of Tamil language, protecting the land of the Tamils and promoting the material interests and aspirations of the ethnic Tamils, the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam was never for damaging the federal fabric of Indian democracy. In fact the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam, the product of Tamil Renaissance, articulated the sentiments like Tamil Inam, Tamil mozhi and Tamil Nadu.

KEYWORDS: Struggle, Agitation, Movement, Nationalism

INTRODUCTION:

Tamil Nadu is one of the 29 states of India. Its capital and largest city is Chennai (formerly known as Madras). Tamil Nadu lies in the southernmost part of the Indian subcontinent. Tamil Nadu is the eleventh largest Indian state by area and the sixth largest state by population. Chennai is now well-entrenched as the capital of the modern state of Tamil Nadu. Not only is it the administrative headquarters but it has also evolved over a century and a half since at least the mid-19th century as the social, political, and cultural capital of the Tamil country. Despite its cosmopolitan nature and a significant minority population, no Tamil could possibly imagine that Chennai could be anything but Tamil. But for some years in the mid-20th century the pre-eminent place of Madras as the Tamil capital came to be challenged by Telugu politicians. "Madras Manade" ("Madras is Ours") captures this controversy in an alliterative Telugu slogan.

Tamil Arasu Kazhagam was identified with the Tamils and continuously struggled for the socio-political, economic and culture rights of the Tamils. Particularly, its struggle for renaming the state and call for state autonomy not only promoted the rights of the Tamils but also their culture consciousness.

Advancement of the Tamils in every walk of life was the guiding principle of the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam. The Tamil Arasu Kazhagam was the first political party to give lead to the movement for renaming the state of Madras as "Tamil Nadu" even before the martyrdom of Sankaralinga Nadar.

The Tamil Arasu Kazhagam, as early as 1955, at the time of the making of the linguistic states, desired to name the state as "Tamil Nadu" However, on 29 November 1955, the Executive council of the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam was held and it passed a resolution. "This council opposes the state comprised of the Tamil speaking areas as "Madras state" and stressed both the governments at the centre and the to name the state as "Tamil Nadu"¹. But, the "Tamil Nadu" resolution evoked little response from the government. After a long wait of 5 years, the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam held a convention at the Gokhale Hall on 25 December 1960. Ma.Po.Sivagnanam (Ma.Po.Si) wrote in his autobiography "people thronged the hall; unprecedented spirit was found overflowing in both the young and old"². After a long deliberation, a unanimous decision was arrived to start agitation from 30 January 1961. It was received with good response and enthusiasm from the gathering.

The period of one month from the convention to the agitation was well utilized by the party for the mobilization of the public. Ma.Po.Si addressed many meeting among college students. The Tamil Arasu Kazhagam also observed "Tamil Nadu" demands week throughout the Tamil districts. Public meeting were organized and addressed. On 30 January 1961 twenty three agitators belonging to the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam, shouting slogans reached Fort St. George where the Assembly was in session. After the adjournment of the Assembly, the venue of demonstration was switched over to the collector's office opposite to the Madras Port Trust. After nine days of demonstration, the agitation was extended to various other towns like Kancheepuram, Vellore, Cuddalore, Trichy, Madurai, Tirunelveli, Nagercoil, Salem, Coimbatore, Kumbakonam and Tanjore. In Madras Ka.Mu.Shareef, K.Kalivaradhan, Sarojini Narayanaswamy were arrested and released. Similarly, many Tamil Arasu Kazhagam agitators all over the state were arrested and released on the same day. So, the agitation could not gain any tempo. To revitalise the agitation, black flag was shown at public programmes of the ministers. About 1700 Tamil Arasu Kazhagam men, who attempted to wave black flags, were arrested and imprisoned.

The Executive council of the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam was summoned on 13 February 1961. It decided to intensify the agitation. On 16 February, a batch of 40 men led by T.K.Shanmugam shouted slogans in front of the chief presidency Magistrate court at Egmore. All the party men were Tamil Arasu Kazhagam men into custody³.

The agitation was suspended on account of the visit of the Queen of England to Madras from 19 February to 21 February 1961 as per the appeal of the Minister. A press release of the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam that the agitation notified that the in all forms throughout the state was suspended till 25 February⁴. As a result of the agitation the Government of Madras, which ignored the demand of the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam in the early stages, came forward to rename the state as Tamil Nadu⁵. But, no statutory provision was made. It was a partial success for the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam.

"Nattunarvu" was one of the three dimensions of Tamil nationalism. Ma.Po.Si renamed the "Pongal Festival" as Tamilar Tirunal" and the same was celebrated with the help of the students of Pachaiyappa's college on 14 January 1946. Tamils claims for the city of Madras echoed in the meeting to counter the claims of Andhars⁶. Hence forward, territorial issues of the Tamils became prominent in the agitational of Tamil Arasu Kazhagam. The city of Madras which has been the capital of the Madras state was also a district for purposes of revenue administration. The percentage of the population speaking the main mother tongues in the Madras city is shown in Table⁷.

Percentage of population speaking the main Mother tongues in the city of Madras

Mother tongue	Percentage 1951 (total population 14,16,056)	Percentage 1961 (total population 17,29,141)
Tamil	67.92	70.94
Telugu	16.55	14.15
Malayalam	2.83	3.35
Kannada	1.12	0.87
Others	11.58	10.69

The Tamils formed 67.92 per cent of the population city of Madras and hence the Tamils enjoyed substantial majority over the other linguistic minorities. The origin of the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam s movement for the city of Madras could be seen in the very seminal stage of the party, as early as January 1946.

Tamil-Telugu dispute about the city of Madras came to the fort-front of politics only in 1938. However, the Andhras claim for the city of Madras could be seen as early as 1917. Nevertheless, persistent demand for the city in the Andhra province began from 1918⁸. The dawn of Independence and the possibility of the reorganization of the Madras province in the near future intensified the dispute between Telugus and Tamils over the metropolitan city of Madras. Consequently, it paved the way for claims and counter claims. The Andhras claim for the city of Madras was based on historical ground and other considerations⁹.

In view of these claims and counter claims over the city, various suggestions were made mostly by the Andhras as to the status of the city in the event of the formation of linguistic province¹⁰. The Telugus suggested that Madras should be made a joint capital, or it should be made into a Chief Commissioner's province on the modal of the present Delhi province¹¹ or division of the city into north, and south Madras, as the capitals of Andras and Tamil provinces respectively and the river Cooum as the boundary between the two¹².

Ma.Po.Si the president of the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam wrote an editorial in Tamil Murasu criticising B.N. Rau's scheme¹³. This envisaged Madras as the common capital¹⁴. A special Executive council meeting of the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam was held and it passed a resolution condemning Rau's scheme¹⁵. On 16 August 1948, the Executive council of the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam met and passed a resolution to retain the capital city with the Tamils and cautioned that any effort to cut off the city from the Tamils would invite strong protest¹⁶. Subsequently, the congress appointed J. V. P. Committee, to consider the question of linguistic province¹⁷. The J.V.P Committee was of the opinion, "If an Andhra province is to be formed its protagonists will be to abandon their claims to the city of Madras¹⁸. The report did not mention that the city should, go to the Tamils. This loophole was interpreted in favour of Andhras¹⁹. This prejudiced attitude reflected Andhras craze for the capital²⁰. It ultimately delayed not only the formation of linguistic provinces but also amicable settlement over the city of Madras.

The vacillating attitude of the Government of India caused Potti sriramulu's death a fast and the report of Justice Wanchoo intensified the dispute over the status of the city of Madras²¹. The separatists, DK and DMK seemed to be interested in making Madras city as capital of Tamil Nadu. But they did not protest against the well articulated claims of the Telugus. Similarly, the Tamil Nadu congress strongly was in favour of retaining Madras to be the Tamil capital. But they could not mobilize the Tamils against the persistent and aggressive demand of the Andhra Pradesh Congress. However, Tamil Arasu Kazhagam with the support of Rajaji and T. Chengalvaroyan gave a fitting response to the challenges posed by the Telugus.

In pursuance of the demand of Ma.Po.Si, the corporation of Madras held a special council meeting on 3 January 1953. Ma.Po.Si, the Alderman of the corporation proposed a resolution. The resolution reads "This council welcome prime Minister Nehru's statement in the parliament dated 19

January 1953 with reference to the formation of Andhra State, consisting of Telugu speaking areas of the undivided Madras State but not including the city of Madras. The city of Madras is an integral part of Tamil Nadu. It is not only naturally inseparable from Tamil Nadu but also an essential part of Tamil Nadu. Any attempt disturbing it would be vehemently opposed. The capital of Andhra State should be formed in an undisputed area within the border of Andhra State at the very same time of the establishment of Andhra State". This council fear that the goodwill and friendly relations of the two states will be affected in the event of establishing the capital of Andhra state even temporarily in Madras. For the development and welfare of the two states, independent capital may be established in each state. Therefore this council opposes the very idea of temporary capital in Madras²².

The resolution was passed unanimously and the copy of the resolution was sent to the president of India, the prime Minister and the Chief Minister of Madras. The leakage of Justice Wanchoo's recommendations and the possibilities of the approval by the cabinet in favour of the Andhras agitated the Tamils. So, protest telegrams numbering about 2000 were sent to the then Home minister Lal Bahadur Sastri. But, what seemed to have clinched the issue was the reported threat of the resignation of C. Rajagopalachari, the Chief Minister, if the Government of India accepted Justice Wanchoo's recommendations²³. Consequently Nehru made an announcement that the temporary capital of Andhra state would be located in Andhra territory only. It settled the issue once for all.

The protracted struggle at the northern and southern boundaries were the two important agitational programmes of the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam. The border struggle of the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam was the another dimension of Tamil nationalism embedded in Tamil literature and its main aim was to restore the border areas²⁴. The border struggle was a political issue born of the aspiration of the Tamil elite who wanted to merge with the Tamil districts. The much ado of the reorganization of state gave a fillip to the border struggle. In fact the border struggle was a tug-of-war of clashing economic interests and conflicting aspirations of linguistic communities of the south India. The dubious policy of the Government at the centre further confounded the border disputes. At this juncture, the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam championed the cause of the Tamils and resorted to restore Tirupathi in the north and Cape Comorin in the south.

The Northern border struggle of the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam was a sequel to the partition of the Madras presidency. The northern boundary struggle and the emergence of Andhra Pradesh were not separate events. Both had telling effects on each other. The process of the partition of the Madras presidency into linguistic provinces led to the problem of territorial dispute between the Telugus and the Tamils. Especially, the formation of Andhra state and the paradoxical attitude of the congress had pushed the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam adopt agitational politics. It successfully ended in 1956, after a prolonged and systematic struggle.

Northern boundary refers in particular to the six disputed taluks of Chittoor district in Andhra Pradesh. These taluks (1) Kalakasti, (2) Puttur, (3) Tiruttani, (4) Chandragiri, (5) Palmaner (including old Kuppam) and (6) Chittoor, were called disputed areas in the state of Andhra Pradesh. It consisted of 1573 inhabited villages and 11 towns with a total population of 12,75,593²⁵.

Disputed Taluks of Andhras and Tamil Nadu²⁶

District	Taluk	Number of inhabited villages	Number of Towns	Population
Chittoor	Kalahasti	292	1	1,36,910
	puttur	174	2	2,30,088
	Tiruttani	286	2	2,32,941
	Chandragiri	213	3	1,65,198
	palmaner	265	2	1,69,739
	Chittoor(including Kuppam)	343	1	3,40,717
Chingleput	Ponneri	355	3	2,62,910
	Tiruvallur	326	1	3,08,314
North Arcot	Arokonam	138	3	2,28,083
	Gudiyatham	165	2	3,48,914
Salem	Hosur	195	2	2,70,687
	Krihnagiri	164	2	2,87,359

Similarly, as shown in Table, certain taluks in the districts of Chinglepet, North Arcot and Salem in Tamil Nadu were disputed by the Andhras. They were Ponneri and Tiruvellore taluks in Chingleput district, Arokonam and Gudiyatham in North Arcot district and Hosur and Krishnagiri in Salem district. The disputed areas in the state of Tamil Nadu consisted of 1343 inhabited villages and 13 towns with a total population of 17,06,267.

On 16th August, the very next day after India's Independence, Ma.Po.Si. with 12 ardent Tamil Arasu Kazhagam men set out to the northern frontier. The itinerary from Thiruvalankadu to Tiruttani took a short period of a week. It was intended to arouse linguistic and cultural consciousness of the Tamils of border areas. During the itinerary, the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam men got unique opportunity to study the feelings of both the Telugus and the Tamils and to address public meeting at Thiruvalankadu, Tiruttani and Tirupathi and to understand the aspiration of the Tamils who spoke Telugu out of necessity and to dire circumstances. The itinerary had thrown open an "issues area" for the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam leadership. At the end of the itinerary, the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam gave a clarion call "we will not forego Tirupathi"²⁷.

On 25 March 1953 Nehru made a statement in the House of the people that an Andhra State consisting of eleven undisputed districts including Chittoor district would be formed²⁸. It watered the seeds of agitation. Soon after Nehru's statement in the Parliament, the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam formed Northern Boundary Protection Council for which Ma.Po.Si. was the president and K.Vinayagam was the Secretary. At this juncture, the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam demanded the Government of India to declare Chittoor district as disputed area and to appoint a boundary commission for the settlement of the border dispute. Accordingly, Ma.Po.Si. started mobilizing the Tamils of northern border. On 12 April the General Council of the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam was held at Madras. It decided to widen the movement in Tamil Nadu also. The Tamil Arasu Kazhagam declared 3 May as "Chittoor Day"²⁹.

The northern boundary struggle prolonged for a period of three years from 1953 to 1956. During the course of the agitation, the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam adopted peaceful methods. The first stage of agitation began on 10 April 1953. It continued till 22 May. Generally, the peaceful demonstration of the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam stimulated good response among the Tamils of Tiruttani, Chittoor and Puttoor taluks. Hartals and processions were held. Though the two week demonstration evoked enthusiasm among the Tamil Population of Chittoor, it undoubtedly led to the provocation of the Telugus and it triggered off linguistic tension and disharmony. Disliking the deteriorating relationship between the two linguistic communities, C.Rajagopalachari the Chief Minister, issued a statement on 21

April 1953. To quote "The Present agitation which has already shown signs of Tamil Arasu Kazhagam an ugly turn and which will needlessly produce ill-will in areas hitherto enjoying peace and goodwill. I do hope that what I have said will be accepted by all people concerned and calm atmosphere restored"³⁰. In view of the Chief Minister's statement, the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam temporarily suspended the agitation.

After suspending the agitation, Ma.Po.Si. who was also member of the Legislative Council since 1952, met the Chief Minister and kept the demand of the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam alive. As the Chief Minister could not give any positive reply, the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam resumed the agitation on 12 May. Thenceforward tense situation began to build up in Tiruttani and Puttoor. At Tiruttani, the police harassed the peaceful demonstrators; the demonstrators overwhelming with emotion violated the prohibitory orders and in the ensuing clash between the police and demonstrators, the police resorted to lathi charge. Many were wounded. The situation was exploited by anti-social elements who entered into the Sub-Magistrate's Court and damaged government property and files³¹. Similarly on 14 May untoward incidents occurred in Puttoor as the Telugus pelted stones at a public meeting of the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam.

The Tamil Arasu Kazhagam's peaceful non-violent demonstration ended in violence. Ma.Po.Si. intervened and geared up the discipline among the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam volunteers. Again at Tiruttani, a peaceful picketing was conducted on 15 May. Tamil volunteers under N.Subramanian resumed picketing before the statutory Sub-Magistrate's Court. K.Vinayakam and Ma.Po.Si supervised the picketing which was witnessed by over a thousand people. The DSP, sub-collector and their authorities were present on the spot and the police kept the picketers, about a hundred yards away from the court. The Taluk Office at Puttoor was also picketed by Tamil Arasu Kazhagam men under the leadership of S.Yakoob Saheb. There was strong police bandobust. The picketing was peaceful³².

As a next move, Ma.Po.Si and K.Vinayakam on behalf of the northern boundary protection committee, met the Chief Minister on 17 May 1953. They appraised him of the picketing campaign in Chittoor area and complained of police lathi charge at Tiruttai. They also requested him to persuade the Government of India to appoint a boundary commission and render justice to the Tamils. The Chief Minister promised to convey the request to the Prime Minister and suggested that the picketing should be stopped³³.

Accordingly, the northern boundary protection committee met on 22 May 1953 at Tiruttani. It resolved to continue the agitation. But, the venue of agitation was changed to Madras. The main causes of the decision were (a) to avoid linguistic disharmony and tension (b) to defeat the attempts of the communists of Andhra who planned to attribute motive to the non-violent peaceful agitation of the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam and (c) to convince Rajaji in accordance with his statement³⁴. Only selected volunteers were admitted for staging satyagraha. On 22 June E.S. Thiagarajan violating the prohibitory order that was in force, held a public meeting and procession³⁵. Similarly in the following days, one after another violated the prohibitory orders. Thirumalai Pillai, Panchayat President of Thiruvankadu and V.K.Karuppusamy also led the satyagraha. The DIC of police, V.R.Rajaratnam reported to the IG of Police that, the agitation reached its climax at Thiruttani on 3 July 1953 at 9.25 a.m., when Ma. Po.Si., MLC defied the order under section 144 Criminal Procedure Code, along with Venkatesan, Vice-President of the local panchayat³⁶. They were Tamil Arasu Kazhagam men into custody and subsequently convicted and sentenced to four weeks severe imprisonment each.

There were demonstrations in connection with the arrest of Ma.Po.Si., the demonstrators were dispersed by lathi charge³⁷. On the evening of 3 July, the Prime Minister of India, released press statement that the Chittoor district would be treated as disputed area and a boundary commission would be constituted soon. This news was immediately passed on to the local leaders including K.Vinayakam. Accordingly, the ban on public meetings were removed. In view of the press statement issued by the Prime Minister and the assurance given by the Chief Minister of Madras. The agitation was called off by the Northern Boundary Protection Committee³⁸.

The police reported on 5 July that the agitation in respect of the modification of the border of the proposed Andhra State in respect of Chittoor district had already subsided and that the situation was likely to improve if the government extended amnesty to the persons convicted in the agitation.

Accordingly the government ordered the withdrawal of prosecution, immediate release of all arrested and imprisoned and cancellation of bail if any. Though the Government of India had accordingly appointed an officer for collecting data regarding all the disputed taluks on the Andhra – Madras border, there was little progress in finding a solution to the disputed areas. The slow move of the government had pained the Tamils of Chittoor³⁹. The bonfires of the Government of Madras was doubted in the Madras Legislative Assembly. A suggestion was also offered to the Government to consult and consolidate the views of all interested political parties⁴⁰.

Agitation was resumed on 24 September 1956 in front of the Madras Assembly⁴¹. To participate in the agitation, two hundred and fifty volunteers from Chittoor district walked the entire distance of 80 miles from Chittoor to Madras in four days and reached Madras on 23 September⁴². Holding placards and flags, the first batch of 50 agitators led by K. Vinayakam defied the prohibitory orders and took procession. The police arrested and put them under preventive custody. Similarly, second batch of agitators led by E.S. Thiagarajan was also arrested. On 25 September, three batches of demonstrators were led by S. Kannapa Mudaliar, C.S. Sachindanandam and K.V. Ghafar Khan respectively. On 26 September, four batches of demonstrators led by K. Balasubramaniam, N.K. Govindasamy Bhagavat Singh and Ma. Po. Si. courted arrest⁴³. On 27 September also four batches of agitators were led by A. Munusamy, A. Paradesi Mudaliar, G.S. Doraisamy and G. Umamathy and they were arrested and put under custody. On 28 September, N.A. Rashed, P. Muthuvel, K. Balakrishnan Reddiar and D.A. Dorai Velayutham led each batch and courted arrest. On the final day, Ka. Mu. Shareef led a large number of agitators⁴⁴. Repercussions of the arrests led to chain pulling of trains at Chidambaram, Mayuram Tiruppur, Vellore and Tiruttani. Consequently all the agitators who were arrested were released unconditionally on 30 September 1956. Then the agitation was temporarily suspended.

The Executive Council planned also the methods and strategy of the agitation. As planned, the Satyagraha was started on 15 October. All over Tamil Nadu, demonstrations were held in front of both the State and the Central Government offices. The agitators also restored to obstruct the movement of trains. Chain pulling was rampant. Then, with the initiative of Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, Ma. Po. Si. met C. Subramaniam and K. Kamaraj Ma. Po. Si. asking for an alternative Boundary Commission, suggested to appoint a non-south Indian to decide the border dispute between Andhra and Madras. It was agreed so. Hence, the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam suspended the Satyagraha on 25 October. H.V. Pataskar, Union Minister of State for Law was appointed to settle the boundary dispute. The government forth with released all the agitators unconditionally.

The Southern boundary refers in particular to the four disputed taluks of Travancore State. The four taluks were Agastheeswaram, Thovalai, Kalkulam and Vilavancode. The nature of the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam's agitational politics in the southern frontier was unique. The southern boundary struggle was actually spearheaded by Travancore Tamil Nadu Congress, a splinter group of the Travancore Congress party, which had close access to the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam. The Tamil Arasu Kazhagam was a stimulant to the Travancore Tamil Nadu Congress in its agitational programme. Since Independence, the merger movement in Travancore state gradually gained momentum and reached a critical stage in 1954. As the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam was also preoccupied with its struggle in the northern frontier, it had little resource for direct involvement. However, the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam, could not eschew the movement of the Travancore Tamil Nadu Congress.

To induce the Travancore Tamil Nadu Congress, the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam organized a conference under the auspices of the Travancore Tamil Arasu Kazhagam on 3 and 4 June 1954. A resolution was passed at the conference. I appealed to the Travancore Tamil Nadu Congress to revive the boundary struggle. The Tamil Nadu Congress adopted an indifferent attitude towards the merger movement in Travancore. But the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam extended its support by sending a few of selected volunteers under the leadership of Ka. Mu. Shareef. On 11 August 1954, on account of agitational tension that prevailed on Tamil Taluks, the Travancore police fired at the percussionists at Marthandam⁴⁵. The very next day Ma. Po. Si. left for Nagercoil. He advised Nesamony, the leader of the Travancore Tamil Nadu Congress to conduct a token peaceful agitation at Nagercoil. But, it was not

agreeable to Nesamony. The police smelt sign of instigation and Ma. Po.Si.was advised to leave Nagercoil by the police.

On their way back, the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam volunteers having known the arrival of Pattom A.Thanupillai, Chief Minister of Travancore, organized a black flag demonstration under the leadership of Ka. Mu.Shareef and with the co -operation of the local Tamil Arasu Kazhagam unit to register their protest against the killings at Marthandam. Ka. Mu.Shareef said that resentment prevailed in the venue of the demonstration and Pattom Thanu Pillai, who passed through the demonstrators, was beaten by broom holding women demonstrators⁴⁶. Within six months since the firing at Marthandam, Pattom A. Thanuillai's ministry fell. A coalition ministry of the Kerala congress and Travancore Tamil Nadu Congress was formed. Panampilli Govinda Menon became the Chief Minister. Meanwhile the States Reorganization Commission submitted its report on 30 September 1955.

The Commission reported, "the demand for Tamil-speaking taluks has a history behind it and has a form that prejudices the political and administrative stability of this area . We have, therefore, considered it necessary, in the special circumstance of this case. In the four southern taluks, namely Agasteeswaram, Thovala, Kalkulam and Vilavancodu situated in what is known as Nanjil Nadu, the percentage of Tamil speaking people is above 79. The wishes of the people of this area have been clearly expressed and there is no particular reason why these wishes should not be respected"⁴⁷. The commission further, reported the necessity of merging Shencottah with Tamil Nadu as it consisted of 93 per cent Tamil population. It also reported, "The Devikulam and Peermedu taluks stand on somewhat different footing and those were hilly areas which, for various economic and other reasons, are of great importance to the state of Travancore Cochin. The percentage of Tamil speaking people in Devikulam and Peermedu taluks is 72 and 44 respectively"⁴⁸. The eleven years of organized movement for the merger of Tamil taluks with Tamil Nadu partially fulfilled. Those are that comprised of the southernmost four taluks was named Kanyakumari district. It began to turn a new leaf since 1 November 1956.

The agitational politics of the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam indeed mainly focussed that the party was more interested in the promotion of Tamil language and the rights and liberties of the Tamils than any other matter. Sound identity with the Tamil ethnic community was the asset of the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam. Though the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam adopted peaceful agitational techniques as a means to achieve its goal, it never restored to fasting. It shows the high - spirited agitational techniques of the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam. The agitational techniques and strategies were not innovative. But for the agitational politics, the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam would not have become a factor in the politics of the Tamils. However, the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam which did not overly aim the capture of political power, restoring to such agitational techniques and strategies was no easy task. It shows the determination of the party to work for the promotion of Tamil and the Tamils.

In the uphill struggle for providing an environment for the growth of Tamil language, protecting the land of the Tamils and promoting the material interests and aspirations of the ethnic Tamils, the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam was never for damaging the federal fabric of Indian democracy. In fact the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam, the product of Tamil Renaissance, articulated the sentiments like Tamil Inam, Tamil mozhi and Tamil Nadu. The combination of those three is otherwise known as the Tamil consciousness leading to ethnic identity of the Tamils. The political identity of the Tamil Arasu Kazhagam was based on Tamil ethnic identity. This chemistry of political identity is invariably common to all regional political parties in Tamil Nadu as well as throughout India.

ENDNOTES

- 1.Chattai,11 December 1955
- 2.Ma.Po.Sivagnanam Autobiography,p.851
- 3.The Hindu, 16 February 1961
4. The Hindu, 18 February 1961
- 5.Madras Legislative Assembly Debates,1961,Vol.XXXIX,pp.481-482
6. Ma.Po.Sivagnanam Autobiography,p.999

7. Census of India 1961, Vol.IX,p.234
8. K.N.Narayana Rao, *The Emergence of Andhra Pradesh*,Bombay,1973,p.226
- 9.*Ibid.*,p.229
10. *Idem.*,
- 11.Report on the Linguistic Provinces Commission , Government of India, New Delhi,1949,p.15
12. K.N.Narayana Rao,*op,cit.*,p.230
- 13.*Ibid.*,p.232
- 14.Tamil Murasu,1 April 1947
- 15.Ma.Po.Si., *Puthia Tamilakam Padaitha Varalaru* (Tamil),1986,pp.124-125
16. K.N.Narayana Rao,*op,cit.*,p.229
- 17.The JVP stands for Jawaharlal Nehru, Vallabhai Patel and Pattabi Sittaramaiah.
K.N.Narayana Rao,*op,cit.*,p.209
18. Report of the JVP Committee , New Delhi,1949,p.14
19. K.N.Narayana Rao,*op,cit.*,p.211
- 20.Ananda Vikatan, 1 March 1949
- 21.K.N.Narayana Rao,*op,cit.*,p.253
- 22.Proceedings of the Corporation of Madras, 3 January 1953
23. K.N.Narayana Rao,*op,cit.*,p.254
24. *Ibid.*,p.256
- 25.G.O.No.3225,Public (Confidential) , 14 December 1953
26. *Ibid.*,
- 27.Tamil Murasu, 1 September 1947
- 28.G.O. No.3316, Public (Misc.),30 December 1953
- 29.Tamil Nadu Congress (TNC) Resolution, Tranquebar session, April 1953
30. G.O. No.3316, Public (Misc.),30 December 1953
- 31.Ma.Po.Si., *op.cit.*,p.393
- 32.The Hindu, 17 May 1953
33. *Ibid.*,
- 34.Ma.Po.Si's Autobiography, p.647
35. *Ibid.*,p.648
36. G.O. No.3204, Public (Misc.),12 December 1953
- 37.*Ibid.*,
- 38.*Ibid.*,
- 39.Dina Thandhi, Madras, 5 February 1954
40. G.O. No.2613, Public (Misc.),27 December 1953
- 41.Chattai, 23 September 1956
42. Chattai, 7 October 1956
43. Chattai, 21 October 1956
44. Chattai, 7 October 1956
45. Ma.Po.Si's Autobiography, p.717
- 46.*Ibid.*,p.731
47. Report of the State Re-organisation Commission, Government of India, New Delhi, 1955,pp.81-82.
- 48.*Ibid.*,p.82