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CHAPTER - V

THE GREAT SPLIT AND ITS IMPACT ON TAMIL NADU CONGRESS

The 1969 split was a consequence of six major events, namely (1) the emergence in the early 1960s of a powerful faction the syndicate - within the party, (2) the Kamaraj plen 1963, (3) the succession of Shastri 1964, (4) the succession of Indira Gandhi 1968, (5) Mrs. Gandhi's re-election as the leader of the Congress Parliamentary Party (CPP) following the 1967 general elections, and (6) S. Nijalingappa's succession to Kamaraj as President of the INC in early 1968.

As Kamaraj was one among the leaders who played a significant role in the split and as Kamaraj belonged to Tamil Nadu, the circumstances that developed in Tamil Nadu in the wake of the split has contributed to the dynamics of the split. This Chapter analyses the impact of the great split on TNC.

BACKGROUND:

TNC, a Model Pradesh Congress, was fast liquidating after it's debacle in the 1967 General Elections. Until that time, the President of INC, Kamaraj, was the unquestioned 'boss' of the Tamil Nadu Congress as well. By clever strategies of eliminating or suppressing all those who did not toe his line of thinking Kamaraj managed over a period of fifteen long years and had a total control
over the affairs of the Tamil Nadu Congress. The support he received from Nehru, the part he played in the elections of two successive Prime Ministers, Shastri in June 1964 and Mrs. Indira Gandhi in January 1968 and his re-election as President of AICC, all these had strengthened his position within Tamil Nadu Congress so much that none in the rank and file of the organisation dared to point out to him any of the weaknesses, that were clearly developing for long within the TNCC.¹

In 1967 suddenly the lid was off and Tamil Nadu Congress was called upon to function as the main opposition party in Tamil Nadu. Now the task was one of re-organising the Congress to perform the duties of a healthy, effective and model opposition. The party which has been in power for twenty years has to act as the opposition party. Secondly, Congress as the ruling party, which had been held together by Kamaraj with an absolute control over all its affairs, was not able to transform itself and specify its activities as an opposition party. There were three modes of thinking and the party was divided accordingly into three distinct factions:

1. There were many who supported C. Subramaniam's thinking, that the DMK should not be blindly opposed but should be questioned on basic issues and on procedural principles.
2. There were also a strong section under former Chief Minister M. Baktavatsalam, which felt that the new rulers must be opposed tooth and nail and all encouragement be given to the younger elements in the Congress.

3. A third group felt that they should be more patient and that constructive cooperation with the ruling party must be continued at least for few years. Kamaraj himself was by and large silent on all these modes of activities and kept people guessing.  

After a lot of heart searching, it was decided that C. Subramaniam should take up the Presidentship of the crest fallen Tamil Nadu Congress and revitalize it amongst the Tamil people, with the whole hearted and sincere help and co-operation of one and all belonging to the TNCC, including Kamaraj. But within six months of Subramaniam becoming the President of TNCC, it was found that he was not given a free hand by Kamaraj to re-organise the Tamil Nadu Congress, in the manner it ought to be done so as to regain its popularity and prestige with the electorate of Tamil Nadu. The first task, C. Subramaniam took upon himself was to organise the 'Youth Wing'. His efforts were thwarted even before he started giving shape to his thoughts and ideas. Instead Kamaraj encouraged his own 'henchmen' to engage themselves in organising public meetings to abuse the ruling party. This Youth Congress got all its inspiration from Kannadasan, a poet, who came into the Congress
fold as a result of his quarrels with the leaders of DMK. Their slogan was 'Kamaraj is Congress and Congress is Kamaraj'. They derived their strength and financial support from Kamaraj himself.

Understandably, this contention was questioned by many Congressmen who have been patiently and silently putting up with Kamaraj's 'dictatorial' management of TNC all these years. Many of them openly came out to organise an anti-Kamaraj front within TNC. Baktavatsalam was in entire agreement with their standpoint and inspired and encouraged them as much as possible to go ahead and expose Kamaraj and his henchmen in the public eye, so that TNC may be freed of hero-worship. They put forward many demands including Kamaraj's withdrawal from public life and removal of his supporters from the Congress. They wanted Subramaniam's hand to be strengthened. There was another section within the TNC which adopted a middle path. They wanted complete freedom of action for Subramaniam to re-organise the TNC on sound and healthy lines so that it may be in a fit condition to face the electorate in the forthcoming elections of 1972 and they also wanted the continuance of Kamaraj. This point of view was shared widely by leaders in different walks of life throughout Tamil Nadu. They clearly saw that factionalism within the TNC would be wholly against the future interests of their party as well as Tamil Nadu itself. With DMK as the ruling party, and with no responsible organised and strong opposition, there would be every possibility that the national interests may suffer.
C. Subramaniam and those supported his stewardship of the TNC in that difficult and crucial period rightly felt, that there was no alternative to the TNC, than to function as a most responsible and right-minded opposition to the ruling DMK party and that it was not difficult to regain its lost popularity amongst the masses of TNC, who have become politically aware. Subsequently, a demand for disciplinary action against Kamaraj was made by fifty one 'freedom fighters' led by R.R. Dalavai. Those who backed this anti-Kamaraj memorial were three senior Congressmen, namely, S.N. Somayajulu, K.T. Kosalram from Tirunelvely and K.S. Muthuswamy from Virudhunagar. In the signed memorial to the Congress High Command they said that Kamaraj had caused 'serious cleavage' among Congressmen and "tarred the fair image of the Congress especially in Tamil Nadu. They alleged that it was because of this the Congress suffered heavy casualties in the general elections of 1967." It added, that Kamaraj while presiding over the Congress organisational set up allowed the anti-prohibition wave to spread inside the Congress. He took the least effort to nip it in the bud. Kamaraj's open advocacy of the two language formula, soon after, the endorsement of the three language formula of the Union Government by the CWC, was also short-sighted enough. His relationship with E.V.R. was also viewed with suspicion. The memorial pleaded for immediate instituting of disciplinary proceedings against Kamaraj in the best interests of TNC. Kamaraj's faith insocialism was also doubted and his leadership was criticised as dictatorial
and autocratic. The memorandum was accepted by the High Command but no action was taken on that.

1969 SPLIT:

In March 1969, TNCC met in which Subramaniam's speech expressed the growing rift between Kamaraj and himself. It was an atmosphere of frustration and defeat following the mid-term elections held in Pondicherry. Earlier Kamaraj had won in the by-elections held in Nagercoil but that did not enthuse the TNC. The two important speeches on that occasion were rendered by Subramaniam, President of TNCC and Kamaraj himself. While Subramaniam called for honest introspection to find out why Congressmen had become so suspect by every section of Tamil Nadu, Kamaraj emphasised the need for Congressmen to get rid themselves of the desire for power. Subramaniam felt that Congressmen should answer the challenge by giving selfless service, in true Gandhian spirit, to win the goodwill of the people. He urged the younger generation to take greater responsibilities, in rebuilding the Congress. He pleaded for greater clarity in the principles, policies and programmes of the party and also a rural orientation for the party instead of the existing urban bias. On the other hand, Kamaraj wanted the Congress leaders to instill a strong sense of nationalism and a broad vision among the people. His speech on that occasion was truly inspiring and was above party politics.
After the AICC Session of INC in July 1969, Subramaniam openly identified himself with Mrs. Gandhi's faction. His criticism of Nijalingappa was resented by the majority of the Congressmen in Tamil Nadu. They felt that it amounted to an open betrayal of the TNCC's unanimous decision to stand solidly behind Sanjeeva Reddy in the presidential election.

In TNC, Kamaraj did not bring up in any political heir nor any one grew so. Like Nehru, Kamaraj also did not give chance for any one to grow and succeed him. Senioritywise, Subramaniam stood next to Kamaraj in TNC. He was a good administrator but was not a mass leader like Kamaraj. He was known to the people of Tamil Nadu as a Minister, but he did not have enough contact with members of the Congress organisation as Kamaraj had. Though he became the TNCC President, he failed to function efficiently and lacked mass contact. But he was optimistic of his position. He felt that: "The present political atmosphere and the so called conflict in the Congress organisation are only emotional, personal and temporary. Implementation of Bank Nationalisation has earned the support of all socialists. Image of Congress has been improved and many former Congressmen, now think of rejoining the Congress. On the other hand Kamaraj wants socialism, not nationalisation of Banks. Kamaraj considers it as one of the many steps and the only step to achieve the goal of socialism. Fortunately, there was no serious dispute over the policy of nationalisation among
the Congress leaders. It is distressing to see the power struggle among personalities. One could understand divergent views being expressed in a party regarding any policy but one shudders to imagine what would happen to the party and the nation, if the conflicts were personal. I stress the need for solidarity as the supreme need of the party.7

The unity resolution of the CWC moved on August 25th, was initiated by S.B. Chavan. It wanted to mitigate the rivalry between the two factions, the Syndicate and the Indicale. By that time the Tamil Nadu CLP unanimously passed a resolution, recommending the disciplinary action against the Prime Minister and others who violated the party discipline in the presidential election. Differences over the unity resolution of CWC was explicit in TNC. The anti-Kamaraj faction whole-heartedly supported it but the Kamaraj faction opposed it. The DCC of North Madras met in September 1969 and supported Kamaraj wholly. They also differed from the TNCC chief supporting the stand of Prime Minister Mrs. Gandhi, on the question of supremacy over the party and demanded the convening of an urgent meeting of TNCC to discuss the issue. Kamaraj's faction further demanded that the Congress President should have the decisive voice over the parliamentary and legislative wings of the party. They feared that in the absence of such consultations the leader of the ruling party in parliament and state legislatures would go by discretion leading to autocratic practices. The meeting was headed by S.G. Vinayagamoorthy.8
Baktavatsalam criticised the attitude of the Congressmen of North Madras and said that they had not only chosen to disapprove certain remarks of the Pradesh Congress President, but had been presumptuous in launching a public discussion on an important issue, like the relationship between the organisational and parliamentary wings of the party. And he also appealed to all Congressmen to act in the spirit of the 'unity resolution' adopted by CWC and desist from indulging in controversies, which would defeat the very purpose of the resolution. 9

C. Subramaniam's attitude and estimation became clear in his appeal to the TNC members for party unity. He pleaded: "There is no infiltration of the communists in Congress at any level. There is no such infiltration in the TNC. Tamil Nadu Congress has three wings namely, Democratic Socialists, Left Radicals and Conservatives. A majority of Congressmen belonged to the first category and those belonging to the third category had played a dominant role in the freedom struggle and formed an influential wing of the organisation. Each wing has its own concept of implementing the reforms......" Subramaniam also called for a truce among the Congressmen in regard to the unity resolution of the CWC and the Prime Minister's perspective of the supremacy of the parliamentary wing, with unfettered powers. He also stressed the need for internal democracy and also added that this crisis was not a new one but a thing which existed during the Nehru's period. 10
On the other hand, B.G. Karuthiruman, a staunch supporter of Kamaraj and leader of the CLP in the Tamil Nadu Assembly, argued that all parliamentary parties were subject to organisational discipline. He disagreed with the views of the Prime Minister. He added that the party ought to be a vital factor, as it was through it the members of assemblies and parliament, the Chief Ministers and the Prime Minister were elected. It was derogatory to float all norms of democracy and it was equally wrong to claim that the leader of the parliamentary party was supreme. He also posed the question: "Whether it would be possible for him, as the leader of CLP, to remove Subramaniam from the Presidentship of TNCC."  

These words intensified the rivalry between the two. The controversy continued to rage in the state, even after it had somewhat died down in the capital with the passing of the unity resolution by the CWC. The split in the party ranks became quite apparent during the visit of Morarji Desai to Madras on September 10, 1969. The rival groups of Congress workers were about to clash in a public meeting addressed by him. The President of South Madras DCC M.N. Manivarma was to preside over the meeting. S.V. Kandaswami opposed and spoke against him. The public was disturbed and the slogans against Subramaniam and his supporter Manivarma were heard. To avoid confusion, Manivarma withdrew from the meeting and S.G. Vinayagamoorthy President of North Madras
DCC, proposed Kakkan's name to preside over the meeting. Subramaniam who was to attend the meeting did not turn up.

After two days, the South Madras DCC passed a resolution which, requested Subramaniam to resign from Presidentship of the TNCC, as he lost the confidence of the Congress workers. They also resolved that they were ready to work according to Kamaraj's advice, as Sanjeeva Reddy was deserted by Mrs. Gandhi.

Soon after, Subramaniam as the President of TNCC extended an invitation to Mrs. Gandhi to visit Madras, Coimbatore and Madurai. Subramaniam also told that her visit was not official and that all the expenses would be borne by the TNCC. He did not consider it necessary to consult Kamaraj or Karuthiruman the leader of the CLP or others in the TNCC about his invitation. He brushed aside, the differences of opinion expressed by senior Congress leaders and thought that her tour would demonstrate the extent to which Congressmen in Tamil Nadu were whole-heartedly behind him and Mrs. Gandhi, and not behind Kamaraj.

It is interesting to examine the reaction of the other faction. The differences in the TNCC which has been simmering for some time burst out. Karuthiruman, disowning Subramaniam's leadership of TNCC, had appealed to the Prime Minister to postpone her tour till October 11, the day fixed for the meeting of the TNCC to elect the new President. He also demanded, Subramaniam to step down from the office in the interest of the organisation.
Commenting on the invitation, he said that the Prime Minister’s visit was decided on his personal behalf and not as a President of TNCC. Subsequently, a signature campaign was also started, demanding Subramaniam’s resignation before the next TNCC meeting. According to one source, the signatures of about 200 out of 400 PCC members have been obtained urging Subramaniam to make way for a new President who would enjoy their absolute confidence.  

The impending tour of the Prime Minister had been the subject of discussion in Congress circles during that time. Congressmen who did not see eye to eye with Subramaniam, accused him for not taking the rank and file into confidence in making arrangements for Prime Minister’s visit, which intensified their campaign against him. This gave rise to a speculation that Kamaraj himself may not be participating in the Prime Minister’s tour. Subramaniam requested Kamaraj to attend the function, but there was no positive reply.

Subramaniam resigned from the Presidentship of TNCC and left it to the Prime Minister to decide whether or not to visit Tamil Nadu. She decided to adhere to the earlier programme drawn up for her. For his part, Kamaraj did not stand in the ways of the Prime Minister’s tour. But at the same time, arrangements made for her tour were not at all elaborate or fitting. The programme drawn was light. At the Meenambakkam airport, Kamaraj received her along with T.T.K. and the State Governor. But the first big
banner outside the airport, put up by the TNCC, was a quotation from Gandhiji on the importance of "discipline". That this angered her was evident from her subsequent argument, that, quoting Gandhiji's utterances out of context was wrong and pointless. And in the meeting itself she was told by one of the main speakers plainly that there was no Congress in Tamil Nadu except under the leadership of Kamaraj and he even reminded her that she had become Prime Minister in 1966 and 1967 with Kamaraj's help. The meeting was utilised to impress upon her what hold Kamaraj had on the people of Tamil Nadu.

In less than two weeks after the Prime Minister's visit, Kamaraj was able to demonstrate his absolute hold over the TNCC. At its two day meeting on October 11th and 12th, Kakkan, Kamaraj's trusted lieutenant, was elected unanimously as the President of TNCC in the place of Subramaniam, Kakkan was a Gandhian and had also been a Minister in the Ministries of Kamaraj and Bakta-vatsalam. Subsequently a six-hour closed door discussion took place and the main theme of debate pertained to the disciplinary action against Mrs. Gandhi, for her conduct during the presidential election. The notable among those who demanded disciplinary action were, S.C.C. Anthony Pillai, S. Chellapandian, R. Krishnaswami Naidu, T.V. Anandan and Akkama Devi. They also described Kamaraj as the unquestioned leader of Tamil Nadu. The TNCC Executive Board was also formed on the same day, which included ironically, C. Subramaniam in it.
By now, Syndicate was able to claim a majority of 12 to 21 in the CWC to ensure a majority for Nijalingappa. Subramaniam was disqualified on the ground, that he ceased to be a member of the AICC after his resignation from the Presidentship of TNCC. This was considered as unconstitutional and unprecedented, by the Indicates. Shankar Dayal Sharma was also dropped from CWC, after his resignation as the party general secretary.

The split in the Congress was complete on 1st November 1969, with the announcement from the Prime Minister's camp that they had decided to call a meeting of the AICC at Delhi on November 21st and 22nd to elect the new President in the place of Nijalingappa. This decision was taken after the move of the requisition of AICC was ruled out by the CWC meeting, under Nijalingappa in the morning. Prime Minister and 9 of her supporters boycotted this CWC meeting.18

On 5th November 1969, TNCC met and its President advised the AICC members from Tamil Nadu not to attend the meeting proposed by Mrs. Gandhi. Fourteen out of twenty six executive members attended including C. Subramaniam, R.V. Swaminathan and T.S. Arunachalam. DCC Presidents of Thirunelveli, Kanyakumari, Salem and Dharmapuri did not attend but wanted to back the Prime Minister. But the TNCC executive backed Nijalingappa and praised Dr. Ram Subhag Singh for his resignation from the Union Cabinet and for his loyalty and spirit of discipline.19
Consequently the supporters of Mrs. Indira Gandhi in Tamil Nadu met in Madras the next day. C. Subramaniam, Baktavatsalam, K.T. Kosalram and eight AICC members were present. They decided to open a separate office of the Requisitionists of Tamil Nadu soon in Madras. They chose temporarily the residence of G. Bhuvaraham, supporter of Indira Gandhi, as the office of the Requisitionists.20.

Subbaramaniam's support for requisition was unequivocal when he said: "The refusal, of the syndicate to face the main party forum, was the stumbling block in resolving the present crisis in the Congress. What is going on in the Congress, is not a 'split' but only a contest in which the group which had majority would have to assume leadership.21 For this Subbaramaniam adduced proof by pointing that 18 of 42 AICC members from Tamil Nadu had signed the requisition .... He felt that the only way to solve the rift was to allow the AICC to express its opinion or if need be, to convene a plenary session of the party. He added that any action blocking their 'constitutional procedure' was undemocratic. He also hinted that the supporting of Mrs. Gandhi also intended to form a separate or rival Congress Committee in Tamil Nadu.

Baktavatsalam was also a signatory to the requisition for the special AICC. He felt that refusal to convene the AICC is a very wrong and reckless step, which might lead to disastrous consequences." For K.T. Kosalram, it was a fascist decision by the sadistic syndicate to ignore the requisition of the 90% of MPs
and a majority of AICC members along with Mrs. Gandhi. Such development could be construed as the fading out of the Syndicate from the Congress. He added that, with the elimination of the Syndicate, the Congress will become more popular with the masses. R.V. Swaminathan construed that the decision was most unfortunate, unwise and unwarranted.\textsuperscript{22}

Later when Mrs. Gandhi was expelled by the CWC, the TNCC Chief Kakkan also endorsed the expulsion. When the Requisition AICC sacked Nijalingappa and made Subramaniam as the interim President, the latter immediately planned to form adhoc state Congress committees for Tamil Nadu, Mysore and Gujarat. Around 150 Congressmen from Tamil Nadu attended the Requisition AICC. Anti-Kamaraj slogans rent the air at that time. T.T. Krishnamachari, Bhaktavatsalam and Tanjal Ramamurthy were the important persons who attended the Requisitions AICC.\textsuperscript{23}

Subramaniam claimed that he had good support for Requisition Congress. He said that the situation had changed radically after the CWC took disciplinary action against the Prime Minister. He claimed that more people have come to their side all over India and Tamil Nadu was not an exception.

Bhaktavatsalam claimed that the party led by Subramaniam was the real Congress, as a majority of AICC members have elected Subramaniam as their interim President. He laid the blame squarely
on the Syndicate for the crisis in the party during and after the presidential election, so much and he called for immediate unity. He also was critical of Kamaraj’s association with the Syndicate and expected him to join the rival Congress forthwith.

For his part, Kamaraj criticised, the inclusion of communists in the rival Congress. Subramaniam resented it and said that there was nothing wrong in including them, as both Congress and the Communists aim at socialism.24

And the TNCC Trust Board was also formed with a majority of pro-Indira faction. Kamaraj, Kakkan, Subramaniam, T.T. Krishna-machari and Baktavatsalam were made the 'Trustees'. Thus the split was complete. Subramaniam said, "the split was good for the country as it had helped the Congress to get rid of the conservatives and facilitated it to take the fast steps to implement socialism."25

Kakkan was bitterly critical of those who attempted to denigrate Kamaraj. And he described 'Kamaraj' as the embodiment of socialism. He reiterated that it was those who thought they could carry on the administration with the help of communists and D.M.K. were really working against socialism and democracy.26

Subramaniam replied, that he would rather align with communists and socialists than with the reactionary forces like Swatantra and Jansangh to achieve socialism through Democratic
means. He also charged Kamaraj as being autocratic in running the organisation and said his anger and hatred towards others coming up in public life blinded his views and he could not distinguish between right and wrong and thus the organisation had to split on questions of policy.\textsuperscript{27}

Both the parties accused each other of working against socialism. A probe into the accounts of TNCC by Subramaniam also strained the relationship between him and Kamaraj.

TNCC under Kakkan met on 5th December 1969 and decided to take disciplinary action against the members who attended the Requisition AICC meeting. Two resolutions passed for taking the disciplinary action were: (1) "Those who chose to side with the Requisition Congress have automatically dismissed themselves from Organisational Congress and consequently no action is needed, (2) Against those persons who had openly gone against the resolution adopted by TNCC, stern disciplinary action should be taken."\textsuperscript{28}

The TNCC also decided to fill the vacancies caused by the exist of Subramaniam and R.V. Swaminathan.

The Kamaraj faction claimed greater following in the Legislative Assembly and in the Legislative Council of Tamil Nadu than the rival Congress. But at the AICC meeting held in Delhi, the rival Congress had the majority. Consequently the High Command of Congress (R) suspended the KPCC and TNCC and appointed adhoc
committees in their places. R.V. Swaminathan was made the President of adhoc TNCC. N.S.S. Manradiyar and G. Bhuvaraman were appointed as Vice-Presidents. While K.T. Kosalram became the Secretary, T. Ramamurthy, S.L. Krishnamoorthy and K. Ramalingam became Joint Secretaries. A.P.C. Veerababu was made the Treasurer. 29 For this, Kakkan could retort only weakly stating that the action of suspension of TNCC, by the ruling Congress as 'injust and illegal'.

Thus the split was complete in Tamil Nadu too, as it was at the centre by December 1969, which resulted in the formation of two state committees TNCC (O) and TNCC (R) headed by P. Kakkan and C. Subramaniam respectively.

In January 1970, TNCC (R) decided that the M.L.As of the Congress (R) should function as a separate bloc in the State Assembly. They also wanted to constitute adhoc DCCs for Thanjavur, Trichy, South Arcot, with Gopalswami, M. Palaniyandi and Sambasiva Reddiar as their Presidents respectively. Also Pasupathi Dhanraj was authorised to organise the Youth Congress in all districts. 30

The impact of the split was seen even at district levels. Disputes between the rival Congress factions for taking possession of the DCC offices arose in many places and this resulted in the arrest of several Congress leaders. 31
The TNCC (O) Executive meeting was held at Salem in February of 1970, which was presided by P. Kakkan, Kamaraj, E.V.K. Sampath, P.G. Karuthiruman, R.T. Farhasarathi and others were present. P. Ramachandran wanted to enrol a minimum of ten lakh members in the Congress (O) during that year. In a draft resolution, they warned Mrs. Gandhi of her discrimination policies against some states and depriving them of even their legitimate rights, which may disrupt the unity of nation. Kamaraj charged her with trying to subvert the state governments that did not toe her line.  

Subramaniam, who justified the split, said: "Split in the Congress will prevent communists getting stronger. More energetic and radical measures taken will restore the faith of the people in our democracy and ultimately in the Congress party". He also accused Kamaraj of speaking in two voices on the language issue, one for the north and other for the south. He asserted in a meeting at Thanjavur that Kamaraj's stand is different from the Syndicate, and so the latter will be thrown out of the party by Morarji Desai."  

In the general body meeting of the TNCC (O), 18 members were elected to AICC, including Moopanar, S. Chellapandian, M.P. Subramaniam and K.T. Parthasarathy.

During the visit of Jagajivan Ram, a meeting of TNCC (R) took place. Jagajivan Ram accused Kamaraj that "the latter's
'personal animosity' towards Mrs. Gandhi was due mainly to the ill-conceived notion that it was the Syndicate which made her as the Prime Minister." K.T. Kosalram, M. Baktavatsalam, R.V. Swaminathan, Kannadasan and others were present in the meeting. Kamaraj immediately refused the charges of Jogajivan Ram.

The impact of the split was seen not only in the TNCC and CLP, but also in the Madras Municipality. V. Balasundram announced in the city council, that he had received a memorandum signed by five Congress members out of fifty two, of the council stating that they were forming themselves into the Congress Municipal Party (Ruling). The new party consisted of Dr. G. Rajamannar, Pasupathi Dhanaraj, V. Adi Kesavalu, Jayasamaraj and Thanikachalam.

The Budget session of March 1970 in the Tamil Nadu Legislative Assembly also faced the impact of the split. There was a wrangle over allotment of seats for Congress (R) in Tamil Nadu Assembly which delayed the speech of G. Bhuvarahan, leader of the six member group of Congress (R). When Bhuvarahan rose to speak, P.G. Karuthiruman, leader of Congress (O) raised an objection to his speaking as well as the procedure adopted to allot the seats.

A petition was filed in the High Court of Madras by Kakkan, the President of the TNCC (O) and P. Ramachandran its Secretary,
for the retention of its permanent electoral symbol of 'two bullocks with yoke', in the by-election to be held in Cheranmadevi Assembly Constituency. The High Court of Madras gave decision to the petition in May 1979. It directed the Election Commission to allot to the candidate proposed to be set up by Congress (O) in the Cheranmadevi Assembly Constituency its permanent symbol of 'Two bullocks with yoke on'.

TNCC even before the split was 'divided house' with groupism and factionalism. The national rift intensified factional conflict and resulted in the formation of Congress (O) and Congress (R). Though Kamraj claimed that the TNCC stood solidly behind him, the anti Kamraj wave which grew after 1967, turned to be pro-Indira and formed the Congress (R) in Tamil Nadu.
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