UNIT 13 E.V. RAMASWAMI NAICKER
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13.0 OBJECTIVES

After reading this unit, you should be able to:
• discuss the context in which E.V. Ramaswami Naicker emerged,
• critically examine his views on the Varnashrama Dharma,
• discuss the relevance of his life and work in contemporary India.

13.1 INTRODUCTION

In this unit you shall be reading about E.V. Ramaswami Naicker, the radical social reformer of our country. Naicker or 'Periyar' as he was popularly called fought a life long battle against the tyranny of those placed higher in the varnashram. The crusade he launched becomes very relevant in the context of present day India where efforts are being made for bringing the deprived and disadvantaged sections of society into the national mainstream.

13.2 EARLY LIFE

E.V. Ramaswami Naicker was a prominent social reformer of India in the twentieth century. He was born of Balijsa Naidu parents on 28 September, 1879 at Erode in Coimbatore District in Tamil Nadu. He came from a prosperous business family in that district. But he did not have any formal education. His childhood days showed rebellious character which continued with his social and political activities. He defied all caste rules and regulations in his childhood and for that he was often taken to task by his parents.

Nevertheless his home was a meeting place for pundits and religious scholars. Their discussions and discourses provided an opportunity to EVR to come to know about some rudiments of (philosophical significance) Hinduism. But soon he changed his role of a passive listener to that of an active participant. He started asking questions about inconsistencies and improbabilities in the puranic stories and ridiculed the basic concepts of Hindu religion and philosophy. More persistent questions were asked by him about the relevance of the institution of caste in society, belief in the theory of karma and the soundness of idol worship. None of the pundits were able to give him convincing answers.

In 1904 when he was twenty five years old, he went to Benares. This was a turning point in his life. Benares, he found, was no more holier than any other city. The Brahmans there ate meat and drank toddy and immoral trafficking in women was a thriving business. Disgusted with all this, he came back to join his father's business at Erode.
EVR proved himself an efficient organiser and executor of various relief measures. In 1915 when there was an outbreak of plague in Erode, he organised relief work with the help of his friends and distributed food and money to the destitute families. He served on various temple committees. He was elected as the Chairman of the Erode Municipality. During his term of office from 1917 to 1919, he executed the Cauvery water scheme which ensured a regular supply of drinking water to the citizens of Erode and thereby earned their admiration.

13.3 POLITICAL ACTIVITIES UP TO 1930

EVR's participation in the politics of Tamil Nadu till 1920 was minimal. He participated in a protest meeting in 1916 organised against the government's action against Home Rule organ, New India. But he maintained political contact with important nationalist leaders from 1917 onwards. The non-Brahmin members of the Tamil Nadu Branch of the Congress organisation formed the Madras Presidency Association in 1917. It was formed to represent and safeguard the non-Brahmin interests in the national organisation and at the same time, to repudiate the claims of the Justice Party to be the sole representative of the non-Brahmin community in the Madras Presidency. However, the immediate aim of the Association at that time was to place before Edwin S. Montague, the Secretary of State for India, a scheme of reforms that would give non-Brahmins full communal representation in the legislature.

Naicker, who attended the inaugural meeting of the Association, was in full agreement with its aims, and particularly its efforts to secure representation for non-Brahmins in public bodies. EVR viewed such efforts for representation of non-Brahmins as inspired by the need for social justice. Brahmin domination in liberal and civil services added a further sharpness to such demand for social justice in the Madras Presidency. Naicker took increasing interest in the activities of the Association, served as one of its Vice-Presidents, participated in all its deliberations and helped to conduct its second annual conference at Erode in October 1919.

As an active member of the MPA, Naicker became familiar with the programmes and policies of the Indian National Congress. Its plans for the liberation of the country appealed to him. Especially its efforts to raise the condition of the masses and do away with untouchability and prohibition impressed him. As the Congress held views similar to his on social reform, he thought by joining the political organisation he could bring about a new social order in the Presidency of Madras.

Once EVR joined the Congress in 1920, his rise was meteoric. Within the Congress, he had the support of C. Rajagopalachari and non-Brahmin politicians. He participated wholeheartedly in the non-cooperation movement, in the temperance campaign and in the campaign launched to replace foreign cloth by the progressive use of Khaddar. In 1920 itself he was elected the President of the Congress (MPC). He fully endorsed Gandhiji's calls for boycott not only of legislatures but local taluk board elections as well. In 1921 he felled all the revenue fetching toddy trees and lost permanent income. In this he showed he would go to the extreme of keeping principle above all other considerations. In the same year he organised picketing before arrack and toddy shop. In November 1921 in order to quell the situation the Madras Government imprisoned him and the other campaigners for over a month under section 144 of the Indian Penal Code.

If Gandhiji's techniques of mass participation provided EVR a chance to have a foretaste of agitation against the colonial power, Vaikom Satyagraha gave him a chance to fight social evils within the Indian Social system. Vaikom was in the princely state of Travancore. Persons of low social status were not permitted to use the road near the temple in that place. To protest against such inequality in society and to maintain the right of untouchables to use the roads and the temples, the Congress members in Travancore launched a Satyagraha with Gandhiji's permission. But the Travancore State swiftly arrested them. Before their arrest they appealed to EVR, then the President of TNCC, to take over the
leadership of the Satyagraha. EVR arrived in Travancore and made provocative speeches against the Gods and Brahmins. Fearing major clashes, the Government arrested him within 6 days of his arrival and issued a warrant to him to leave. But he defied it, was arrested and sentenced to 6 months imprisonment. However, he was released two months earlier on account of the Maharaja’s death.

But the Vaikom Satyagraha revealed the positions EVR and conservative sections in the society held on the question of untouchability. EVR launched his agitation on principle but he could not foresee the reaction of the conservatives. He could not recognise that the age old practice of untouchability could not be eradicated by one satyagraha or violent speeches against Gods. It had to be fought at every level over a long period without communal rancour.

Check Your Progress 1
Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.
   ii) Check your answer with that given at the end of the unit.
1) Briefly discuss Naicker’s political activities till the 1930s.
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13.4 GURUKUL CONTROVERSY

In January 1925, E.V. Ramaswami Naicker and others came to know that at the Congress funded Gurukulam at Shermadevi, in Tirunelvelly District, non-Brahmin boys were forced to eat apart from the Brahmins. This issue agitated the minds of the Congressmen but they were not able to intervene in the Gurukulam affairs. At the Tamil Nadu Congress Committee meet in Trichinopoly, a compromise resolution was agreed by which the committee recommended that all organisations partaking in the national movement should shun all gradations of merit based on birth. Ramaswamy Naicker himself agreed with the resolution. He said that if the country was not yet prepared to accept this state of thing, it was the duty of the non-Brahmins to create public opinion which was receptive to their rights.

Failure to settle the issue of the Gurukulam, in particular the refusal of the Brahmins to take a firm stand on this question, widened the rift between the Brahmins and the non-Brahmins in the Congress. Even efforts made by EVR and another individual with the mandate from the TNCC to disperse with the communal restrictions failed to produce results. EVR whose criticisms so far were directed against the social evils and Brahmin domination in the bureaucracy now directed charges against the Congress organisation itself. At Salem in April 1925, he spoke that the Brahmin question should be settled even while the British supremacy lasted in the country. Otherwise non-Brahmins would have to suffer under “the tyranny of Brahmanocracy.”

While this question opened a rift between the Congress and EVR in the Tamil Nadu Congress, two other issues completed it. They were (1) the question of communal representation and (2) the controversy with Gandhiji on Varnashram Dharma. On communal representation, EVR held the view that in a society marked by caste hierarchy, representation of Brahmins only in bureaucracy and other liberal professions would mean only consolidation of caste hierarchy in
society. A majority of non-Brahmins denied access to economic and political power would remain low in social hierarchy. To lift them he suggested communal representation. This was in line with MPA's aims and objectives within the Congress organisation of the Madras Presidency.

At the Kanchipuram Conference of the TNPCC in November 1925, EVR sought to get a mandate from the Tamil Nadu Congress on the question of communal representation. This body accepted the demand for communal representation 'in principle', but refused to let it take a 'statutory shape' on several occasions. This EVR interpreted as a clever move to sideline the significant question. He further interpreted such a move in communal terms. He felt that Brahmins were in the national organisation only to further their own political interests rather than to strive for the independence of the country. He contended that Brahmin leaders on account of their vested interests were opposed to any measure that sought to improve the political fortunes of a majority of the non-Brahmin community.

Check your Progress 2

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.
   ii) Check your answer with that given at the end of the unit.

1) What was the Gurukul controversy involving Naicker?

13.5 VARNASHRAMA DHARMA

EVR held very strong views against four-fold division of caste hierarchy in the Indian society. He joined the Congress for its lofty ideals and goals, one of which was the abolition of untouchability. His fight against it at Vaikom was by itself a vigorous agitation which engaged the susceptibilities of Brahmins. Moreover, the Justice Party's formation was itself a revolt against Brahmans and Varnashrama dharma. In such a context, any attempt to reinforce such belief in Varnashrama dharma would be counter productive in the Madras Presidency.

Unfortunately, Mahatma Gandhi expressed his firm belief in Varnashrama dharma on September 1927 at Cuddalore. He appealed to the non-Brahmins that in their ire against Brahmins, non-Brahmins should not wreck the system of Varnashrama dharma, the bedrock of Hinduism. However, he stoutly rejected the notion of higher and low status attached to the system of Varnashrama dharma and suggested that neither the ban on intermarriage or that on interdining was an integral part of it.

But to many non-Brahmins in the Tamil region, Varnashrama dharma could mean the superiority of Brahmins over the rest of the population. EVR was very condemning of Varnashrama dharma. He considered that it included the relegation of all the non-Brahmin caste Hindus to the position of Shudras in the Tamil region. He felt that if each caste were to follow its own Dharma, non-Brahmins would be forced to serve the Brahmins. "When we think of ourselves as Shudras", said Ramaswami Naicker, "we accept ourselves as sons of prostitutes."

Naicker met Gandhi in September 1927 with a view to mollifying Gandhi's stand on varnashrama dharma. He expressed his deep concern over Gandhi's statements and pointed out that this only strengthen the orthodox Hindu position on the question of untouchability and child marriage, the two evils against which Gandhi himself was fighting. As the views of both of them were diametrically opposed, talks were not successful. Naicker expressed his
confirmed belief in the "Kudi Arasu" that true freedom for India would be achieved only with the destruction of Indian National Congress, Hinduism and Brahminism.

This extreme step pushed him to support even the statutory Simon Commission which was boycotted by the Congress. He went to the extent of criticising the civil disobedience campaign in 1939. But soon seeing the public reaction against himself, he changed his own opinion and accepted the Indian National Congress as the sole organisation fighting for freedom. He urged the government to abandon its repressive measures against Congress satyagrahis and made a pointed reference to the futility of convening the Round Table Conference without Congress participation.

EVR viewed the Gandhi-Irwin Pact as a moral victory for the Congress. In that pact he saw the government conceded the Congress claims that it alone had the mandate to speak on behalf of a politically insurgent India and its views should be heard at all future conferences. In 1934 after 9 years of break with the Congress, EVR was asked to come back to the Congress fold by C. Rajagopalachari. EVR accepted the suggestion provided a common programme was agreed upon as basis for supporting the Congress. Accordingly, they jointly formulated a programme which was sent to Gandhiji for approval. The most important aspect of this programme was that the TNCC should agree to implement the principle of communal representation in all the representative bodies, in the civil and the liberal professions. As this was totally unacceptable to Gandhiji, Rajaji's efforts to bring Naicker back into the Congress fold failed.

**Check Your Progress 3**

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) Check your answer with that given at the end of the unit.

1) Examine Naicker's views on the Varnashrama Dharma.
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**13.6 THE SELF-RESPECT MOVEMENT: 1925**

E.V. Ramaswami Naicker gave a concrete shape to his ideas on social reform by founding the *Suyamariyati iyakkam* otherwise known as the Self-Respect Movement. It was a reform movement dedicated to the goal of giving non-Brahmins a sense of pride based on their Dravidianist past. The movement denied the superiority of the Brahmins and their implicit faith in the present system. The movement sought to turn the present social system topsy-turvy and establish a living bond of union among all the people irrespective of caste or creed, including the untouchables. One of the essential points was a denial of the mythology of Hinduism by which, it contended that, the unsuspecting were made victims of the Brahmins. Since the Brahmin was seen as a leader of the social and religious life of Tamil Nadu, he became the target of 'Self-Respect' attacks.

The tone of the movement was determined by EVR, who represented a new type of leader in Tamil Nadu. He was uneducated in English and able to speak only in Tamil in the popular idiom. The self-movement concentrated almost entirely on the Tamil Districts. It covered primarily the groups low in the social hierarchy like the Vanniya Kula Kshatriyas and the untouchables. Special
efforts were also directed at women and young people. Because of the directness and simplicity of its message, the illiterate and semi-educated in the rural areas turned to the movement. This was a new development in Tamil Nadu politics. The Justice Party, which claimed to be the sole representative of the non-Brahmins did not bother to cover these groups. In fact, the leadership of the Justice Party was drawn from the landowning groups and attempted to cover the middle classes and landowning classes.

Even before the Self-Respect Movement was founded in 1925, EVR started expressing his views on the evil in the society. The Tamil language weekly Kudi Arasu (People’s Government) founded in May 1924 became the organ of the Self-Respect Movement. It was specially directed at certain non-Brahmin groups that had not been reached by the Justice Party’s Dravidian. Shortly after 1930, Ramaswami Naicker began a Tamil daily called Viduthalai (Freedom) and in 1935 he started a Tamil monthly called Pakkuthariu (commonsense). But in the late 20’s Kudi Arasu was the movement’s propaganda weapon.

Since the Self-Respect Movement had as its target the Brahminical tradition, its symbol came under attack. On a number of occasions, the manusmriti was burned. Certain characters in the puranas were changed. For instance, Ravana in the Valmiki’s Ramayana was held up as the hero and be an ideal of good Dravidian conduct. Rama was seen as a wicked and unjust Aryan.

Attack of this kind on Hindu scriptures and its symbols however were criticized even by non-Brahmin leaders apart from Brahmins. But their criticisms did not have any impact on the Self-Respect Movement’s tone. The propaganda of the Self-Respect Movement continued and even grew sharper. Songs about self-respect leaders were printed and distributed and pamphlets were issued to explain the movement’s aims. Some of these caricatured the characters of the Hindu pantheon. One of them was Vasittira tevarkal kortu (wonderful court of Deities) published in 1919.

The most important of the early activities of the Self-Respect Movement was the convening of the first Provincial Self-Respect Conference at Chingleput on February 17, 1929. The conference proceedings reflected its strong egalitarian bias and its determination to boycott Brahmin priests, its desire to attract young people and women and above all its commitment to what it considered to be Dravidian civilization.

At this conference many resolutions were passed. One called on members to refuse money for the construction of temples or for the employment of priests or intermediaries. Another condemned Varnashrama dharma and arbitrary division of society into Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaisyas and Sudras, and Panchamans, and repudiated belief in superiority based on the “accident of birth”. Another resolution condemned the use of all suffixes and terminations connotative of caste. And as for women, a resolution was passed claiming for them the same rights of inheritance as men and advocating that marriage should be terminable at the will of either party. True to their spirit, self-respecters upheld a total disbelief in the religious validity of Brahmins, “Self-Respect weddings” without the use of Brahmin priests became common.

Though some Congress leader like P. Vardarajulu Naidu opposed resolutions like refusal to give fund to temples for renovation purpose, these resolutions remained the main plank of the Self-Respect Movement. But anti-religious tone of the management was moderated by EVR after his visit to the Soviet Union. He toured the Soviet Union for three months as the leader of the Rationalistic Association of South India, a new name given to the Self-Respect Movement, when he was on tour in Russia, he visited other parts of Europe as well.

The visit to the Soviet Union had a deeper impact on EVR. He was inspired by the “Phenomenal progress” the Russians had made in agriculture and industry and attributed this to Russian systems. He, therefore, maintained that unless India also made radical changes on the lines of the Soviet system, there would not be any meaningful system in the country.

Soon after the return from the Soviet Union, EVR sought the assistance of Singaravelu Chetti who was a prominent communist in South India to frame a new programme. The new programme envisaged the formation of two wings
Colonialism, Cast Order and the Tribal Societies

within the body of Self-Respect League Samadharma (Communist) Party of South India. Both aimed at achieving political independence for the country through constitutional methods, distribution and public transport, amelioration of the condition of the industrial and the agricultural labourers and working with redoubled vigour for the original aims of the Self-Respect Movement. These aims of the two wings of the movement were termed as the Erode Programme.

He carried on his propaganda on Socialism and Social reform through his Kudi Arasu and other organs. But his editorial in Kudi Arasu 'Why today's Government should be overthrown, forced the Government to arrest him and charge him with inciting the people to overthrow the constituted authority by force.' EVR did not challenge the charge but sent a written statement to the court to this effect: "For the last 7 or 8 years I have been propagating the principles of Socialism and in a democratic way with the aim of bringing about social and economic equality among the people. This is in no way an offence.... Followers should be prepared to face such repressive measures that might be let loose by the government."

But after his release, he did not stick to political programme of the Self-Respect Movement. He increasingly came to concentrate on the social reform question. Side by side, he carried on a political propaganda as well against the Justice Party for ignoring the interests of the non-Brahmins to defeat the Congress candidates in the municipal and legislative elections. But defeat of the Justice Party candidates in the Legislative elections in 1936 showed that the Justice Party was no longer a political force. But EVR moved closer to the Justice Party rather than to the Congress which won the elections.

Check Your Progress 4

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.
   ii) Check Your answer with that given at the end of the unit.

1) Write a brief note on the Self-Respect Movement launched by Naicker.

13.7 LANGUAGE CONTROVERSY

In the Legislative Council elections, the Congress won a sufficient number of the seats to form a government and C. Rajagopalachari became premier of the Madras Presidency. In accordance with the Congress policy, he announced (to the Press) that Hindi would be introduced as a compulsory course of study in the school curriculum for the first three forms.

The decision to introduce Hindi in the Madras Presidency ignored the linguistic differences between the North and the South and overlooked the strong currents of regionalism which were themselves an outcome of the cultural revivalism that had taken place half a century ago. Political awakening that was brought about by leaders like C. Rajagopalachari, Satyamurthi, E.V. Ramaswami Naicker and Thiru. V Kalyanasundara Mudaliar when they were all in the Congress organisation in the 20's was very much created in their mother tongue, i.e. Tamil.

There were two main reasons for the Tamil scholars opposition to Hindi. First, the introduction of Hindi meant to them the revival of Sanskrit — a language
which they traditionally opposed. Secondly, the mother tongue was not a compulsory subject in the curriculum in those days and many passed out of the schools without a knowledge of the Dravidian tongue. Therefore, they argued that the introduction of Hindi in the schools without making the mother tongue also a compulsory subject was a deliberate attempt to relegate the Dravidian languages to the background.

These genuine fears were ignored and Hindi was introduced in April 1938 in the schools. Agitations and demonstrations were launched against Hindi. Meanwhile the leaders of the Self-Respect Movement organised a march from Trichinappally to Madras in order to strengthen public opinion in favour of the anti-Hindi movement. It was sent off by EVR and other leaders at Trichinappally. It comprised one hundred and one members, took out a long route which passed through Trichinappally, Tanjore, South Arcot and Chingleput and covered 234 villages and 60 mofussil towns.

The most important feature of the anti-Hindi movement was the participation of a large number of women in the agitation. EVR also participated in the women's conference on 13th November 1938 and asked the women participants to fight against “Hindi Imperialism”. And on 14th instant, he appealed to the women to protect that mother tongue ‘from the onslaught of an Aryan and alien language’. After these two speeches a large number of women came to participate in the anti-Hindi movement and many of them were arrested and sentenced to imprisonment for picketing schools.

For the speeches made on the 13th and 14th November 1938, EVR also was prosecuted for inciting the women to participate in the anti-Hindi agitation and was sentenced to one year rigorous imprisonment and to a fine of Rs. 1000. Public opinion did not approve of this harsh sentence. Therefore the sentence was changed into a simple imprisonment of 6 months and he was transferred from a ‘C’ class to an ‘A’ class prison. But before the term expired EVR was released on health grounds. But Hindi was withdrawn from the schools only in 1940.

EVR because of his past experiences with the Congress which he considered as Brahmin dominated, opposed even liberal policies of the C. Rajagopalachari Ministry. Sometimes he sought alliance with any one opposed to the Congress with the sole purpose of making that party unpopular. One example was his stand on the Temple Entry Bill. The Bill made it possible for Harijans in the Malabar Districts to enter and worship in the temples. One section in the Brahmin community, the Sanatanists, started agitation against Harijan entry in Hindu temples.

In spite of the Sanatanists’ opposition to the temple entry bill, EVR did not support G. Rajagopalachari’s efforts to bring about social change in the Tamil society. Instead he was quite willing to compromise his own cherished and much advocated social aims like the uplift of Harijans and accommodate the Sanatanists for immediate political gains.

Naicker’s opposition to the Congress did not rest with the Temple Entry Bill alone. It was extended to raise demand for a separate Tamil Nadu called Dravidianad. To some extent this demand was the culmination of a separate identity kept up over for about 50 years or so. The writings of Caldwell and G.U. Pope and other western writers, besides contributing to Tamil revivalism, also fostered a sense of new identity of Dravidianism. But EVR gave a political dimension to a nebulous identity by passing a resolution at the Executive Committee of the Justice Party in 1940. He expressed his views in the Mail of 15 November 1939 that the concept of a Tamil nation was nothing new but had been adumbrated since the inception of the Justice Party. The concept had manifested itself as a political credo only in 1937 when the political Brahmins under the aegis of the Congress threatened his goal, he started a campaign. The nationalist press like the Swadesamitran criticized his demand as “mischievous” and “dangerous”. Despite that he carried on his propaganda. He joined the Muslim League and supported its demand for partition. Jinnah’s two nation theory, advocating reasons for establishing a separate Muslim nation, was conceded and upheld by EVR as the only solution for the Muslims to live harmoniously in a nation dominated by the Aryan Brahmins. The League’s role
in the politics of the nation, EVR said, was not to disrupt national unity; to defend the right and privileges of the Muslims and all the other minorities in the country.

But the demand for Dravidianad did not acquire any prominence and the Justice Party itself was a decline. EVR's leadership of it did not add up to its image. At the 1944 Salem Conference, the Justice Party was rechristened as the Dravida Kazhagam. The new name was expected to reinvigorate the party image. But the authoritarian leadership of EVR did not allow any change to take place. Again the Dravida Kazhagam under the leadership of EVR was split into two in 1949 when a considerable number of members of that body left it in protest against EVR's marriage with a woman of many years younger than himself.

After 1949, EVR's role in the Tamil Nadu politics was less considerable. He carried sporadic agitations against C. Rajagopalachari's education policy in 1954. He came to support the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu, Kamaraj as "pure Tamilian", since he hailed from the backward community of Nadars. But increasingly, the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam, a splinter group of the Dravida Kazhagam, became a major political force. The Dravida Kazhagam lost its importance as a pressure group even under his own stewardship.

Check Your Progress 5
Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) Check your answer with that given at the end of the unit.

1) What role did Naicker play in the anti-Hindi agitation that waged in the South in the early part of 20th century?

13.8 LET US SUM UP

EVR Naicker represented the new emerging forces in Tamil Society. He was a stout follower of Gandhian methods of struggle against the colonial power. But on the question of communal representation and varanashrama dharma, he differed from the Congress and Gandhiji and even left the Congress. The Self-Respect Movement was a new development and was a revolt against the artificial division of society into varnas. The movement attracted the masses who were hitherto untouched and claimed to fight against social evils like untouchability. The more enduring aspect of the movement was the elevation of Tamil and Tamil culture. Some of the caste rigidities were removed and representation of non-Brahmin communities for which EVR fought consistently in liberal services was secured. But it had also negative features. It uncritically assimilated the racial theories propounded by foreign scholars. It saw inequality in society in terms of Brahmin contrivance and dominance. This communal outlook led him to call the Congress and the national movement as Brahmin dominated. He even went to the extreme extent of siding with the Muslim League and raising the demand for Dravidianad. But he maintained throughout that he was not against Brahmins but was against Varnashrama dharma, and Brahmins' claim to superiority. His close association with C. Rajagopalachari despite political differences was evidence of his sincerity.
13.9 KEY WORDS

Varnashrama dharma: Belief in four-fold division of society into (1) Brahmins, (2) Kshatriyas, (3) Vaisyas and (4) Sudras.

Self-Respect Movement: Movement founded by EVR to make individuals self-realise themselves as equals in society without distinction of caste or creed.

Dravidastan: Demand raised by EVR for a separate nation consisting of four states in the Madras Presidency under the protectorate of the British Empire.
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