



ROLE OF S.SATHYAMURTI IN SWARAJ PARTY

T. AKILANDESWARI,

Ph.D Research Scholar (Full-Time),
PG & Research Department of History,
Government Arts College (Autonomous),
Karur-639005.
Affiliated to Bharathidasan University
Email id: akila06081988@gmail.com
Moblie: 9487755647

Dr. F. JUDAS MARY,

Assistant Professor,
Research Advisor & Convener,
PG & Research Department of History,
Government Arts College (Autonomous),
Karur-639005.
Email id: mg.judasmmary@gmail.com
Moblie: 9600212777

ABSTRACT

S.Sathyamurti was one of the most mind-blowing national leaders prominently and troublemaker of South India. He was effectively taken an interest in the Civil disobedient and Quit India Movement. He was silver tongue order. He acted a worker multi-confronted personality in Madras congress session. In 1921 Sathyamurti apprehensions and reservations about Gandhi's conception of non-co-operation thus represented more individual response to the complete boycott of British goods one of the unmistakable members and secretary of the Swarajya party from Tamilnadu. Chosen for the Madras Legislative council at first swarajist up-and-comer. A committee which went into this question and which consisted among others of C.Rajagopalachari, V.J.Patel and KasturirangaIyengar presented a partitioned report. While the committee unanimously suggested that the Provincial Congress committees be enabled to start restricted mass civil disobedience on their own responsibility. It was similarly separated on the suggestion that the Council passage be allowed as a means to wreck the reforms from the inside.

Keyword

Civil Disobedient Movement, Quit India Movement, Non-Co-operation Movement, Madras Legislative Council, Freedom Movement,

The Emergence of the Swaraj Party

After the suspension of the Non-Co-operation Movement, another Political party-Swaraj Party ruled the political scene. It worked as a party inside the Congress. It trusted in non-cooperation inside the Legislative Council. It was maintained by all nationalists in the country and organized the country for the accompanying time of the open door struggle.

The Swaraj Party was moved by supportive of progress leaders like C.R. Das and Jawaharlal Nehru on 1st January of 1923, different Congressmen with the same interest KasthuriRangaIyengar, Vararajulu Naidu, SrinivasaIyengar, Vijayaragavacharai, and A. RengaswamyIyengar joined the new party. In the political decision that was hung on thirteenth November 1923 for Central Legislature, Swarajists A. RangasamyIyengar, N. SrinivasaIyengar, and R.K. ShanmugamChetty were chosen from Tamil Nadu. Despite the fact that the Swarajists won 41 seats in the political decision held for the Legislature drove by Sathyamurti. The Tamil Nadu Swarjist Legislators offered uncompromising block to all Government supported laws. He decidedly supported the movement of no confidence moved by C.R. Reddy against the decision justice party. By their consistent Legislature conduct, the Madras Swarajists ascended to the desires of the Swaraj Party.

Birth of Swaraj Party

The Gaya session of the Indian National Congress was overseen by Chitranjan Das in 1922, who proposed the Council section, in any case, was dismissed by the proposals passed by C.Rajagopalachari who requested that the council passage was against the soul of non-cooperation of Gandhi. C.R. Das surrendered his presidentship and outlined an alternate party inside the Congress on first January 1923 with C.R. Das as President and Jawaharlal Nehru as Secretary. The Congress-KhilafatSwarajya Party outlined at Gaya was fittingly coordinated under the name and style of Swarajya Party at a comprehensive social occasion of the party held at AnandBhawan, Allahabad from twentieth to 22nd February 1923.

After the Allahabad Conference, C.R. Das set out on a journey through the Southern areas of India. His visit demonstrated productive as he set forth for the individuals that the end should be kept in see and that the depression, disappointment, and frustration made by the suspension of the Non-Co-operation Movement after the shocking episode at ChauriChaura should be emptied. In the Madras Presidency, A.RangaswamiIyengar, Sathyamurthi, A.KaleswaraRao, V.RamadasPantulu, B.Venkatratnam, K.V.Sami, and others developed parts of Swarajya Party in January 1923 to contest the elections to the provincial and focal overseeing legislatures.

S.Sathyamurti assumed a main part in the Swarajist struggle for council passage. He was the head of the opposition party in the Madras Legislative Council during the period somewhere in the range of 1923 and 1926. He used to attack willingdon's arrangement of non-Brahmin ministry and Government repression during the Non-Cooperation movement. The Swarajists were successful in using points of system to trap the ministers and the leader councilors and to postpone the business of the council. The Government responded by fixing the Council system. A long way from constitution wrecking, the Swarajists and the United Nationalists set aside energetic opportunity in the language and conventions of the British Parliamentarianism. The obvious reason was that the Independents who had a place with no party, the Moderates and the Khilafatists didn't get together with the Swarajists. At the point when the Swarajists won 11 seats in the commonplace legislature, the nationalist papers looked at them with additional sympathy and favor than previously.

Objectives of The Party

The Swaraj Party arranged its Political program in its overall chalked out measurements program in the councils and program among most of India. The previous was to be completed in a deliberate way by Swarajists as significant individuals, with the assistance of their associates and individuals on the same line from other political gatherings in the council. Following were the plans to -

- refuse supplies and right monetary plans proposed by the public authority
- stand against proposals for legislative establishments
- take steps for migration of the administration and pass resolutions to improve the country
- keep the channel of public abundance from the country by taking on an unmistakable economic approach
- Safeguard industrial and commercial interests of the country
- Item the legitimate right of mechanical and agrarian work and change better connection among tenants and landlords.

Furthermore, it was charged upon the party laborers not to acknowledge any office as a gift of the public authority regardless of compensation or any sort of compensation. The individuals were expected to look for political decisions to various councils in conformity with the demanding control as cherished in the party command.

Activities of Swaraj Party

The second political race to the Madras Legislative Council was to be done on 31st October 1923. The council section controversy reached a conclusion in a compromise when the All India Congress Committee on 26th May 1923 in Bombay got a proposal speaking to the Congressmen not to seek after the 'No vote' exposure among the voters, in this manner leaving the field open for, the Swarajist to compete for the elections. Also, on seventeenth September Congress passed a compromise resolution in a session in Delhi permitting Congressmen to rule for and contest elections, simultaneously reaffirming its confidence in Nonsavage Non-Cooperation. In this manner, the resolve of the Swarajists was significantly supported. The party which anticipated destroying the Constitution declared to contest the elections and acknowledge office. Consequently, it continued strong purposeful exposure against the Justice Party. In any case, in the 1923 political race, an addition of 11 seats was not remarkable. Regardless, it affected the fortunes of the Justice Party.

In the third political race that was held in 1926 to the Legislative Council, the Swarajist embraced overwhelming strategies of purposeful exposure. They composed open shows, gatherings, and house to house crusading, including bhajan parades like those conducted by the Congress in the non-cooperation fight in 1921. This method for electioneering brought "Legislative issues down from the Gokhale Hall to the seashore, from the club to the intersection". However, the Justice Party embraced the conventional procedure for contacting the high-profile individuals in towns and villages and affecting them. Swarajist could not crusade that successfully as E.V. Ramasami had dispersed communal assaults. To counter his assaults, more non-

Brahmins were taken care of by the party. The outcomes demonstrated the nature of Swarajists as it ensured about seats against Justice Party's 21 seats.

Participation of the Party in the Legislative Council

The Swarajists took a powerful part in the Legislative procedure whose essential objective was to demonstrate that Diarchy was impractical. In the second Council C.R. Reddy, a conspicuous non-Brahmin pioneer had left Justice Party and moved a no-confidence motion against the Justice ministry. The Swarajists headed by Sathyamurti outlined the most vocal get-together and maintained the movement. Sathyamurti stated that this movement will be acknowledged and supported as it is accepted that to the greatest benefit of this Presidency, this coterie of true hunters which hosts been taking on the presence of a Political party should be supplanted by a non-communal and enthusiastic ministry." Despite Swarajists, Congress, and Independents backing this movement, it failed considering the assistance of the Governor to the ministry.

In the third Legislative Council, the Swarajists endeavored to talk about in the Council matters connecting with the Government external relations by relating the Presidency's contribution in such issues, as else they were presumably going to be denied by the Governor on the ground that they didn't fall inside the ward of the Madras Government. A case of this is found on account of a suspension movement moved by Sathyamurti on 27th January 1927 to talk about "the action of the Government of India in sending Indian soldiers in China.

Sathyamurti required was that the Madras Legislative Council should request that the Madras Government advise the Government in regards to India that it didn't endorse the decision to send Indian soldiers to China. As soon as Sathyamurti moved this movement; the President alluded it to C.P. Ramaswamy Iyer, the Law part, who after intermission instructed the Council that the senator had refused the movement. The accompanying significant subject that was talked about in the Council in October 1927 was the expulsion of the sculpture of an English General named Neil.

That's what Sathyamurti explained "This general was at risk of a couple of violations against the Indians during and after the Great Revolt of 1857. He is accounted for to have burnt a couple of towns and executed an immense number of honest men, ladies, and youngsters, after the East India Company's military had smothered the Revolt." These were conscious demonstrations of Vandalism and dread based oppression Committed by the General to shield the British power in the country commented Sathyamurti. The resolution was the outcome of a Sathyagraha movement that had been continuing for specific months past for the departure of the Statue.

The public authority caught many driving men who took an interest in the Sathyagraha, walked them in open roads in Madras in their Khaddar dress, and hands fortified, on the love of taking them to the courts. Without a doubt, the authority individuals after some conversation, finally initiated votes to oppose it. A couple of chosen individuals from the Council had connected with them to give some respect for the sentiments of the individuals on this request. After the resolution was crushed, a couple of inquiries were

posed in the Council about the conditions of the Neil sculpture Satyagrahis in the correctional facilities. This was everything that could be done, while the sculpture stood where it was and the Sathagrahis served their terms in prison. In this manner, the Madras Swarajists assumed the prevalent job in Legislative Council anyway they didn't shape ministry.

The Swaraj Party and S.Sathyamurti

Sathyamurti was a splendid parliamentarian who particularly brought out in the collection of his speeches Mr. Speaker, sir. He continued to win a second term in the Madras Legislative Council arrangement of 1926. Notwithstanding, his week in the Council didn't come in that frame of mind of dynamic national commitment specifically created by the Swaraj Party of the Indian National Congress as it called itself.

In January 1924, the Labor party came to control in amazing Britain under Ramsay MacDonald as Prime Minister. It was a minority Government, Labor being the biggest single party. Sathyamurti kept in contact with MacDonald and his old companion Col Josiah Wedgwood who he trusted would become Labor secretary of state for India. It was, at any rate Lord Olivier who was designated to this position and Sathyamurti kept in contact with him as provoked by his Labor companion Benjamin spoor.

Ruler Olivier's answer to Sathyamurti dated 26 April 1924, especially the last sentence, enthused the last so much that he releases it to the press. Did he do the identical purposely to score a point over the decision Justice Party in Madras or did he recognize a distinction in disposition in the British government that he expected to bestow to individuals overall? This made a tumult both in a declaration to the press that he assumed the obligation for distributing the letter which, he raised, was not checked private a perspective generous acknowledged by Lord Olivier who safeguarded himself in England by pointing out that what he had said in the letter was by his known unreservedly communicated views. Nonetheless, Laborturn out to be no improvement over the conservatives in their India strategy and, regardless, the Labor government was eliminated from office later in 1924 and lost the ensuing general political decision, due, Party at any rate, to the scandalous zinc view letter.

The undertakings of the Swaraj Party were not continually running easily, either in that frame of mind at the Central level. In Madras S.SrinivasaIyengar who had come over to the Swarajist, having shed one a more prominent measure of his misapprehension,' which he supported and that for a couple of years and had been made the head of the Party was not commonly content with Sathyamurti and the others. Sathyamurti and the Swaraj Party in the Madras Legislative Council had outlined a coalition with the United Nationalist Party (a non-Brahmin Party contrary to the Justice Party, which is also a non-Brahmin Party) of C. NatesaMudaliar and C.R. Reddy. S.SrinivasaIyengar didn't support this and wouldn't countenance a joint political race stage to fight by races. The letters from SrinivasaIyengar and A. RangaswamiIyengar (who supported Sathyamurti) addressed these issues. Jayakar, Kelkar, and Aney were for tolerating Ministership which the party was reluctant to and which even Sathyamurti could not consent to after his release from prison in February 1924. At this point, Gandhi had signed a settlement with C.R. Das and Jawaharlal Nehru that while suspending non -

cooperation movement; he would consent to the Swaraj Party working in the Councils 'in the interest of the Congress'.

Then Sathyamurti coasted the possibility of a Congress PR Bureau in England. Gandhiji was against it, in any case, was anxious to allow the Swarajist to undertake it. The proposal finally showed up as a small-time designation to England. Jawaharlal Nehru the head of the party inclined toward the idea yet advised against committing the party in any capacity. Sathyamurti endeavored to convince C.R. Das to accompany him. Das' strong answer, dated 19 April 1925, will convey tears to the eyes of every admirer of this unbelievable nationalist. He passed away in June when Sathyamurti was in England. No letters are relating to the subtleties of this visit from June to August 1925, yet Sathyamurti kept an eye on a couple of gatherings an enormous number of them under the insurance of the Independent Labor Party (Fenner Brockway was of extraordinary assistance). He was exceptionally confused by the show of individuals from the Labor party (presently in resistance) remembering RamsayMacdonaldd and his old pal Josiah Wedgwood for the discussion on India in the spot of commons. Strikingly, Sathyamurti and his once and future rival A. RamaswamiMudaliar made common reason at various gatherings a ton to the diversion and consternation at home.

The Swaraj Party persevered through Splits after the demise of C.R. Das with Jayakar, Kelkar, and others leaving it. LalaLajpatRai and Mohan Malaviya maintained the Council section and acknowledgment of office. The congress had passed on all work in the Legislatures to the Sawaj Party with the 'Constructive program' being taken consideration of by a free association known as the All-India spinners Association. Soon it came to be acknowledged that the Swaraj Party in the Councils and the Central Assembly was the Congress party. Rajaji was convinced to speak to the voters of the Madras administration to cast their surveying structure for the Swaraj Party in the November 1926 political decision to the Council. He thus convinced a hesitant Sathyamurti to instigate in the Council for preclusion, a reason dearest to his heart. S.SrinivasaIyengar, the head of the SwarajParty in Madras, dealt with the Guwahati Congress of 1926. Sathyamurti was reappointed to the Madras Legislative Council in the arrangement of 1926. He continued to be dynamic in Madras and Congress legislative issues, as showed up by the letters from Rajaji in 1925-1926 and from C.P. RamaswamiIyer in 1927. He was kept busy with between and intra-party controversies anyway sadly; there are no letters accessible as proof of this period.

To support the Swaraj Party, gatherings were held in Madras on January eighteenth - nineteenth, 1923, and the Tamil Nadu Swaraj Party was formally presented with A. RangaswamiIyengar as President and S. Satyamurthy as Secretary. Its essential projects for the year 1923 were to accord its assistance to the Congress comparable to Swadeshi, Khadi, Temperance, Untouchabilliy, and the headway of National Education and Arbitration Courts. It would likewise attempt to grow the quantity of individuals on the Congress rolls. The Party would make strides to contest decisions to nearby boards and regions with the ultimate objective of making sure about control of the Nationalists over the area and metropolitan undertakings. One more program was to figure out how to propel the plan of a settlement between the Brahmin and Non-Brahmin Communities in the district. Anyway, the quick objective of the Party was to contest races to the commonplace and central councils to be held in October 1923.

To spread the strategy of the Swaraj Party, C.R. Das visited Madras in 1923 and kept an eye on various gatherings. In the gatherings, he underlined that one of the constitutional standards of the Swaraj Party was that they should not acknowledge office under Diarchy. Be that as it may, they expected to enter the councils en masse and to propel the national interest. On the off chance that it was not acknowledged by the British government, they would contradict the Government in each measure. Everything was to be restricted to keep them from administering through the Councils without a solution. Regardless, Rajaji contended that hindrance and destroying of the Constitution through constitutional methods were illogical and it was a less than ideal confirmation of destruction.

The Swaraj party and 'Council Entry'

The communication among Sathyamurti and Jayakar and the letters from Jawaharlal Nehru showed the remarkable activity that Sathyamurti endeavored to get the Swaraj Party going. He was interested to convey a speech in Bombay however he was puzzled by the absence of support. Besides, he was restless. The Congress was bit by bit yielding in its disposition to the Swarajists during the year 1923. The ACC meeting at Allahabad in February 1923 acknowledged goals, moved by Rajaji and seconded by Jawaharlal Nehru, that all purposeful exposure for and against Council section should be suspended till 30th April. This is the compromise Jayakar's letter on 19 March 1923 alludes to last option, in an unprecedented session of the Congress held in Delhi in September 1923, a customary compromise was consented to under which permitting the individuals who expected to do as such to enter the councils.

There were required contentions inside the Swaraj Party. Afterward, the Swarajists started thinking responsibly and contested the elections held in November 1923 to the Central Legislative Assembly and the provincial Councils accommodated under the Act of 1919. Yet again here, Sathyamurti jumped the gun in documenting his assignment for the University seat in the Madras Council, which irritated Jawaharlal Nehru. Sathyamurti requested help towards Rs 2000 that he expected for the political decision. He visited Madras region crusading with C.R. Das and he won a famous Victory to dispatch the start of a splendid profession as a lawmaker and a parliamentarian. This was the second Council chosen under the 1919 Act, in any case, the primary arrangement of 1920 had been boycotted by Congress.

Regardless of the best endeavors of Sathyamurti and A. RangaswamiIyengar, in the Madras Provincial political decision held in October 1923, the Swaraj Party won just 11 seats that included four Khilafatists out of the 98 seats. The Justice Party had the biggest number of applicants returned. Denied access to the assets just as the organizations of the T.N.C.C. restricted time for proclamation, cracked inside the Congress and the powerlessness to win the assistance of numerous persuasive Non-Brahmins in Tamil Nadu provoked the disappointment of the Swaraj Party. Undaunted by the disappointment, the Swarajists attempted to win the most outrageous number of seats in the Assembly. As a consequence, five out of the six Assembly seats from Tamil Nadu were gotten by the Swarajists and the other seat was won by a Liberal. The Justice party won no seat in the Assembly Election.

In different Attitude of Swarajists

Since the Justice Party ensured about the most outrageous number of seats, it shaped the Ministry in Madras. There came about a change this time with the advancement of a solidly composed restriction partnership known as the Nationalist Party. The Swarajists in Madras also joined the United Nationalist Party consisting of Independents and Anti-Ministerial Parties. The head of the Liberal party was C.V.S. NarasimhaRaju. Its Executive Committee consisted of S. Sathyamurti, C. NatesaMudaliar of Madras, C. Ramalinga Reddy of Chittor, T.SRamalingamChetti of Coimbatore, and P. Subbaroyan of Salem. Most of the Swarajists seemed to have made themselves office bearers and others against the Congress Policy. This impassive disposition of the Swarajists in Tamil Nadu was assaulted from all sides. They had been accused of unfaithfulness to the Congress Party. It was obvious from their strategies that the Tamil Swarajists were less fascinated by the destruction of diarchy than in looking to work it for their possible advantage.

Surrender to Swarajists

On the other hand, numerous Congressmen, unfit to stay with Congress, left legislative issues passing on the space to the Swarajists. As such, A.I.C.C. was taken over by the Swarajists. On September 22, 1925, the A.I.C.C. met in Patna and chose to work according to the arrangement of the Swaraj Party. The Kanpur Session of the Congress held in December 1925 acknowledged that decision. The Congress No-Changers completely abandoned the Swarajists. It had its repercussion in Tamil Nadu as well. The Party which worked under Rajaji for five long years vanished from the scene. Some appreciated constructive work while others resigned from administrative issues. The T.N.S.P. driven by S. SrinivasaIyengar came out successful. He had a gathering of workers, who included C.N. MuthurangaMudaliar, KandaswamiChetty, Sami VenkatachalamChetti, Bashyam, Satyamurthy, and A. RangaswamiIyengar. The Congress No-Changers like P. Varadarajulu Naidu, Rajaji and T.S.S. Rajan had either resigned or wrecked themselves on wicked ways. Some confined their respect for the purposeful exposure of Khadi as they really trusted its political and economic ideals. Non-Cooperation and other Gandhian approaches were surrendered. The Council Entry transformed into the acknowledged strategy. Thusly, Congress went heavily influenced by Swarajists.

In this manner, the Special Congress Session of Delhi in September 1923 lifted the prohibit on Council Entry. Regardless, it articulated that Congress was not obligated for any of the functions run by the Swarajists. The A.I.C.C. meeting in Allahabad in January 1924 permitted the Swaraj Party to work in a coalition with resistance with the ultimate objective of embarrassing the Government. In a gathering held in Calcutta on November 6, 1924, the Swaraj Party was permitted to work in provincial and focal councils as a fundamental piece of the Congress. Congress moreover suspended the Program of Non-Cooperation as a national program with the special case for the degree that it was related to the refusal to use unfamiliar garments. The A.I.C.C. meeting in Patna on September 22, 1925, concluded that Congress should work according to the arrangement of the Swaraj Party. It was acknowledged by the Kanpur Congress Session of the Session conducted in December 1925. Thusly, it completely surrendered to the Swarajists and the call of the Swaraj Party was an official choice. Right away, the Swarajists called themselves Congressmen and contested political decisions as Congressmen.

Conclusion

The Swarajya Party rose from humble beginnings to achieve political clout inside Congress circles as well as past outside. The party's leaders displayed foresight and statesmanship, yet in addition gave Indian nationalism another bearing and direction. Despite philosophical differences, Gandhi supported the Swarajists. He let them test their program, however he also gave over the Congress association to them. As a result, Swarajists won control of the Congress. In Tamil Nadu, they battled the Justice Party without holding back. Leaders like as S. Sathyamurti promised to demolish the Justice Party. The Swarajists backed non-Brahmins and corrupted the Justice Party's authenticity. Numerous Justices surrendered from their party, bolstering the Congress' ranks. Mr. Speaker, sir, the collection of Sathyamurti's remarks exemplifies his ability as a government official. In the Madras Legislative Council elections of 1926, he won a second term. His week in the Council, notwithstanding, didn't keep him from participating in dynamic national service, especially the activities of the Swaraj Party of the Indian National Congress, as it was known. A person or administrator might pass away out of the blue, yet their name will always be recollected. From 1930 to 1934, Sathyamurti was the President of the Swaraj Party's common branch, and from 1936 to 1939, he was the President of the Tamil Nadu Congress Committee. From 1934 to 1940, he served on the Imperial Legislative Council and as Mayor.

Reference

1. Ayasub Ali, *The Lessons of Elections'*, in Indian Review, 1924, p. 23.
2. F. N.R., 3 April 1924.
3. F. N.R., 3 April 1924.
4. E.F. Irschick, *Politics and Social Conflict in South India: The Non-Brahmin Movement and Tamil Separatism 1916-1929*, Oxford University Press., Bombay, 1969. p.312.
5. M. John, *Feminist Perspectives on Family and Marriage: A Historical View*. Economic and Political Weekly, 2005, p.40.
6. Madras Legislative Council Proceedings, Volume 35, March 1927, p.52.
7. Madras Legislative Council Proceedings., Volume-37, October 1927, p.367.
8. Madras Legislative Council Proceedings, Volume-37, October 1927, pp.157-158
9. *Navasakthi*, 2 November 1923.
10. F. N.R., 19 November 1923.
11. Dr. P. Rajaraman, *The Justice Party A Historical Perspective, 1916-37*, Poompozil publication, Madras, 1988, p.222
12. Rangaswami Parthasarathi, (1978). "*A Hundred Years of the Hindu: An Epic Story of Indian Nationalism*", Madras, p.30.
13. D. Sadasivan, *The Growth of Public Opinion in the Madras Presidency (1858 – 1909)*, Madras, 1974, p. 18.
14. AICC File no.38 of 1923.
15. B. Pattabhi Sitaramayya, *The History of the Indian National Congress*, Vol, 1, p.260.

16. R.Sundraralingam, *Politics and Nationalists Awakening in South India, 1852 – 1891*, Arizona: Arizona press 1974, p. 38.

17. *The Hindu*, dated 21 January 1923.

18. *The Hindu*, 14 March 1924

19. *The Hindu*, 21 January 1923.

20. *The Hindu*, 29 March 1923.

21. *The Hindu*, 5 April 1923.

22. Tamil Nadu Swarajya Party, *The Way to Swaraj: Speeches of Desabandau Das* (Madras, 1923), pp.19-20.

23. *The Hindu*, 5 April 1923.

24. Madras Legislative Council Proceeding XVII, dated 21 March 1924, pp.906-914.

