DIRECTORATE OF DISTANCE EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH BENGAL

MASTER OF ARTS-POLITICAL SCIENCE

SEMESTER -I

ELECTORAL POLITICS

ELECTIVE-105

BLOCK-1

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH BENGAL

Postal Address:

The Registrar,

University of North Bengal,

Raja Rammohunpur,

P.O.-N.B.U., Dist-Darjeeling,

West Bengal, Pin-734013,

India.

Phone: (O) +91 0353-2776331/2699008

Fax: (0353) 2776313, 2699001

Email: regnbu@sancharnet.in ; regnbu@nbu.ac.in

Wesbsite: www.nbu.ac.in

First Published in 2019

FOREWORD

The Self Learning Material (SLM) is written with the aim of providing simple and organized study content to all the learners. The SLMs are prepared on the framework of being mutually cohesive, internally consistent and structured as per the university's syllabi. It is a humble attempt to give glimpses of the various approaches and dimensions to the topic of study and to kindle the learner's interest to the subject

We have tried to put together information from various sources into this book that has been written in an engaging style with interesting and relevant examples. It introduces you to the insights of subject concepts and theories and presents them in a way that is easy to understand and comprehend.

We always believe in continuous improvement and would periodically update the content in the very interest of the learners. It may be added that despite enormous efforts and coordination, there is every possibility for some omission or inadequacy in few areas or topics, which would definitely be rectified in future.

We hope you enjoy learning from this book and the experience truly enrich your learning and help you to advance in your career and future endeavours.

ELECTORAL POLITICS

BLOCK 1

BLOCK 2

BLOCK 1 – ELECTORAL POLITICS

Introduction to the Block

In this block we will go through representation systems, party system in India, phases of electoral politics

Unit 1 focuses on representation.

Unit 2 focuses on party system

Unit 3 focuses on single party and multi-party system

Unit 4 focuses on regional and state parties

Unit 5 deals with on coalition politics

Unit 6 deals with federalism

Unit 7 phases of electoral politics

UNIT - 1: INTRODUCTION TO REPRESENTATION SYSTEMS

STRUCTURE

1.0   OBJECTIVES

After studying this unit, you should be able to:

- learn about significance of representation system
- understand what is the model of representation
- learn about theories of representation
- learn about Independent candidates and political representation in India

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The concept of political representation is misleadingly simple: everyone seems to know what it is, yet few can agree on any particular definition. In fact, there is an extensive literature that offers many different definitions of this elusive concept. [Classic treatments of the concept of political representations within this literature include Pennock and Chapman 1968; Pitkin, 1967 and Schwartz, 1988.] Hanna Pitkin (1967)

provides, perhaps, one of the most straightforward definitions: to represent is simply to "make present again." On this definition, political representation is the activity of making citizens' voices, opinions, and perspectives "present" in public policy-making processes. Political representation occurs when political actors speak, advocate, symbolize, and act on the behalf of others in the political arena. In short, political representation is a kind of political assistance. This seemingly straightforward definition, however, is not adequate as it stands. For it leaves the concept of political representation underspecified. Indeed, as we will see, the concept of political representation has multiple and competing dimensions: our common understanding of political representation is one that contains different, and conflicting, conceptions of how political representatives should represent and so holds representatives to standards that are mutually incompatible. In leaving these dimensions underspecified, this definition fails to capture this paradoxical character of the concept.

This encyclopaedia entry has three main goals. The first is to provide a general overview of the meaning of political representation, identifying the key components of this concept. The second is to highlight several important advances that have been made by the contemporary literature on political representation. The third goal is to reveal several persistent problems with theories of political representation and thereby to propose some future areas of research.

1.2 SIGNIFICANCE OF REPRESENTATION SYSTEM

In the common view, **political representation** is assumed to refer only to the political activities undertaken, in representative democracies, by citizens elected to political office on behalf of their fellow citizens who do not hold political office. However, the lack of consensus in the political literature on political representation belies this common view. Theorists of representation differ not only in their definition of representation but also, among other things, on what the duties of a representative are, who can be called representative and how one becomes a representative.

In **The Concept of Representation**, Pitkin identifies four distinct views of political representation that emerge in the political literature on the subject:

1. Formalistic Representation, including:

   Authorization

   Accountability

2. Symbolic Representation

3. Descriptive Representation, and

4. Substantive Representation

Formalistic views of representation identify political representation with the formal procedures (e.g. elections) used in the selection of representatives. Pitkin distinguishes two formalistic views on political representation - the authorization and accountability views. Under the authorization view, a representative is an individual who has been authorized to act on the behalf of another or a group of others. Theorists who take the accountability view argue that a representative is an individual who will be held to account. Generally, the authorization and accountability views of political representation are discussed, separately or in combination, in the context of representative government.

The descriptive and symbolic views of political representation according to Pitkin describe the ways in which political representatives "stand for" the people they represent. Descriptive representatives "stand for" to the extent that they resemble, in their descriptive characteristics (e.g. race, gender, class etc.), the people they represent. On the other hand, Symbolic representatives "stand for" the people they represent as long as those people believe in or accept them as their representative.

Pitkin argues that these views of political representation give an inadequate account of political representation because they lack an account both of how representatives "act for" the represented and the normative criteria for judging representative's actions. Hence Pitkin proposes a substantive view of representation. In this view of political representation, representation is defined as substantive "acting for", by representatives, the interests of the people they represent.

Under representative democracy, **substantive representation** (in contrast to descriptive representation) is the tendency of elected legislators to advocate on behalf of certain groups.

Conflicting theories and beliefs exist regarding why constituents vote for representatives. "Rather than choosing candidates on the basis of an informed view of the incumbents' voting records, voters, it is argued, rely primarily on the policy-free 'symbols' of party identification". Politicians, it would seem, have little to fear from a public that knows little about what laws their representatives support or oppose in the legislature.

Descriptive representation is the idea that elected representatives in democracies should represent not only the expressed preferences of their constituencies (or the nation as a whole) but also those of their descriptive characteristics that are politically relevant, such as geographical area of birth, occupation, ethnicity, or gender.

Sometimes voting systems that obtain proportional representation may achieve descriptive representation as well. However this can be guaranteed only to the extent that voting patterns reflect descriptive characteristics of the voters.

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. Discuss the elements of representation.

_____

_____

_____

2. Discuss the importance of substantive representation
and Descriptive representation.

_____

_____

_____

1.3 TYPES OFREPRESENTATION SYSTEMS

Models of representation refer to ways in which elected officials behave in representative democracies. There are three main types: delegate, trustee, and politico.

1.3.1 Delegate Model

A delegate is someone who is elected to represent and convey the views of others. The Delegate Model of representation suggests that representatives have little or no capacity to exercise their own judgement or preferences. They are merely elected to be the mouthpiece of their constituency and act only the way their constituents would want them to, regardless of their own opinion. Joseph Tussman, stated "The essence of representation is the delegation or granting of authority. To authorize a representative is to grant another the right to act for oneself. Within the limits of the grant of authority one is, in fact, committing himself in advance to the decision or will of another".

1.3.2 Trustee Model

A trustee is someone who acts on behalf of others, using their knowledge, experience and intelligence upon a certain field. The Trustee Model contrasts with the Delegate Model as this time constituents 'entrust' their elected representatives to represent them however they see fit, they are given autonomy to vote and behave in the best way for their constituents. Edmund Burke, who formulated the model stated in a speech "You choose a member indeed; but when you have chosen him he is not member of Bristol, but he is a member of parliament... your representative owes you, not his industry only, but his judgement; and he betrays, instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your own opinion".

1.3.3 Politico Model

The Politico Model came about when theorists recognised that representatives rarely consistently act as just a delegate or just a trustee

when representing their constituents. It is a hybrid of the two models discussed above and involves representatives acting as delegates and trustees, depending on the issue.

Other Models

The Mandate Model views representatives as less independent actors. This came about after the emergence of modern political parties; now constituents rarely vote for a representative based on their personal qualities but more broadly, they vote for their party to be elected into government. A mandate is an order or instruction from a superior body therefore this model suggests representatives follow the party line and must carry out policies outlined during election campaigns.

The Resemblance Model is less concerned about the way representatives are selected and more concerned whether they resemble the group they claim to represent. It is similar to descriptive representation, they argue that to represent a group of people such as the working class or women to its full potential you must be part of that social group yourself. Therefore, only people who have shared experiences and interests can fully specify with a particular issues.

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

3.   Discuss the three main types of representation.

_____

_____

4.   Discuss the other models

_____

_____

1.4 FOUR TYPES OF REPRESENTATIVES

There are different concepts of what a representative should be and the duty which he owes to his electors. We divide them into four types: (1) The Mirror type; (2) The Chameleon type; (3) The Statesman type; and (4) The Party member type.

The advocates of mirror type of representation explain that representatives should mirror or reflect the electorate they represent. They should be precisely like the people, rich and poor, farmers and industrialists, lawyers and merchants, teachers and medical men, landlords and tenants, in every representative assembly and exactly in proportion to the numerical strength of each class in the population of the **State**. For example, if two- thirds of the population is agriculturists then, the assembly should in that proportion consist of the farmers and others directly or indirectly engaged in agriculture. It is urged that common people representing other common people can best represent the will of the people and they are the best to tell the government what it cannot do and what the people will not stand. This is tantamount to what actually the body-politic could have done if they were to decide the problems themselves.

The Chameleon type is the representative who does what exactly his electors tell him to do, nothing more, and nothing less. He should change his views as the chameleon changes his colour. This type of representation is also known as the telephone type of representation. According to this view, a representative is the deputy or agent of the people who elected him and he speaks as his master's desire it. He exercises little independent judgment except in the process of trying to discern what his constituents want. He is not expected to make any alteration or modification in the terms of his instructions without the express authority of his electors. In fact, he has no wishes or will of his own as a representative. This type of representation is also known as instructed representation and was generally the accepted theory of representation in the early stages. In a federation, members representing the constituent States in the Upper House of the federal legislature were

deemed as ambassadors of the States they represented. It was, accordingly, the inherent right of the States to instruct them about the attitude and stand they were to take on different problems before the legislature and the manner in which they would vote on a particular issue. But the modern theory of representation outright rejects the idea of instructed representation. Laski regards it as wholly false. Lieber considers it "unwarranted, inconsistent and unconstitutional." Intelligent instruction, it is maintained, is not available. It is altogether impossible to ascertain the real and genuine will of the electors. They are also entitled to know their views on all current problems. They may reasonably ask for their explanation on any question of their decision. But the representatives cannot and should not subordinate their judgment to the will of the electors. If a representative is to appeal to his electorate on every point in order to get their verdict, the representative ceases to have either morals or personality.

Nor can he keep abreast of events and the needs of his country when he knows that he may be thwarted at every step and with as many instructions as there are voters. The instructions given may not only be conflicting, but diametrically opposed to each other. This is not the purpose of representation and representative democracy. The legislative assembly consisting of the chameleon type of representatives has no coherent voice, no maturity and no stability and firmness in the transaction of the business before it. When all representatives speak in deference to the wishes of their own constituents, the legislature is not a forum of discussion. It is Babel of tongues. The statesman type of representative finds its classic definition in the words of Edmund Burke. He said, nearly two centuries ago, "Your representative owes for not his industry only, but his judgment, and he betrays instead of serving you if he sacrifices it to your opinion."

The representative must respect the view of his constituents, he should endeavour to redress their grievances and feel their pulse and act accordingly. But he must not sacrifice his independence of judgment and narrow his horizon of approach to various problems such as ,

He should look at all problems from the national rather than from a local viewpoint. Burke also gave a true analysis of the relationship between the electors and their representatives. "The Parliament," he declared, "is not a Congress of ambassadors from different and hostile interests, which interests each must maintain as an agent and advocate against other agents and advocates. But parliament is a deliberative assembly of one nation, with one interest, that of the whole where not local purposes, not local prejudices, ought to guide, but the general good resulting from the general reason of the whole. You choose a member, indeed, but once you have chosen him, he is not a member of Bristol, but he is a member of parliament." A national assembly is an embodiment of national interests. Burke tried to emphasise: find the best man to represent you, a man in whom you would have full faith and confidence as your representative, but once you have elected him depend upon him to use his judgment about what is best.

The concept of statesman or uninstructed type of representation is based on two important facts. The first is that most people are not well enough informed about problems confronting the government to make decisions, and, secondly, that, even if they were, the process of decision making is so difficult and complex as to preclude the people as a whole from exercising a good judgment on isolated issues.

If instruction is to be the basis of representation, able and conscientious men can hardly be expected to serve in legislatures where they are expected to say only what it pleases their electors. They will keep themselves away from such a farce of representative institution rather than to serve therein. The services of great, talented and experienced statesmen would, thus, be lost to the nation.

The fourth type of representative is the party-member type. Elections are now contested by political parties rather than individuals. The voters vote for a party and its programme. It is, accordingly, necessary that the representative should rigidly live up to his party label even if he is to surrender his independence of judgment as well as dependence upon the judgment of his constituents. The theory is that political party is the only

real vehicle of representative democracy and for the accomplishment of political programme. It is the party that selects candidates to contest an election and campaigns to win it and, thus, constituting the majority to form the government and to implement its policies. If it is in Opposition, it must oppose the party in power, criticise its policies and expose it to the electorate in order to win their support and to win elections. In whatever role the party is, it is nothing without the unity, solidarity and disciplined duty of the representatives elected on the party ticket. They must swim and sink together. If a representative elected on the ticket of a particular party decides to change his party label, political morality demands that he should submit himself for re-election on the ticket of the party to which he now owes allegiance "Clearly, he is not entitled," as Laski has said, "to get elected as a free trader and to vote at once for a protective tariff." The consensus of opinion now is that there is much to be said in support of the party- member type of representative. A representative democracy is unthinkable without political parties. A reasonably fixed legislative tenure provides a sufficient guarantee to the constituents to judge the party by what it did for them. No political party can to any dangerous extent afford to misrepresent the feelings of its constituents.

When the party is judged by the constituents at the general election and people vote for its programme, the unity of the party demands that members elected on its tickets must act in unison as disciplined adherents. Without such a code of conduct representative democracy cannot succeed.

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

 5.   Write an essay on 4 types of representatives.

_____

_____

1.5 CONTEMPORARY ADVANCES OF POLITICAL REPRESENTATION

There have been a number of important advances in theorizing the concept of political representation. In particular, these advances call into question the traditional way of thinking of political representation as a principal-agent relationship. Most notably, Melissa Williams' recent work has recommended re-envisioning the activity of representation in light of the experiences of historically disadvantaged groups. In particular, she recommends understanding representation as "mediation." In particular, Williams (1998, 8) identifies three different dimensions of political life that representatives must "mediate:" the dynamics of legislative decision-making, the nature of legislator-constituent relations, and the basis for aggregating citizens into representable constituencies. She explains each aspect by using a corresponding theme (voice, trust, and memory) and by drawing on the experiences of marginalized groups in the United States. For example, drawing on the experiences of American women trying to gain equal citizenship, Williams argues that historically disadvantaged groups need a "voice" in legislative decision-making. The "heavily deliberative" quality of legislative institutions requires the presence of individuals who have direct access to historically excluded perspectives.

In addition, Williams explains how representatives need to mediate the representative-constituent relationship in order to build "trust." For Williams, trust is the cornerstone for democratic accountability. Relying on the experiences of African-Americans, Williams shows the consistent patterns of betrayal of African-Americans by privileged white citizens that give them good reason for distrusting white representatives and the institutions themselves. For Williams, relationships of distrust can be "at least partially mended if the disadvantaged group is represented by its own members"(1998, 14). Finally, representation involves mediating how groups are defined. The boundaries of groups according to Williams are partially established by past experiences — what Williams calls "memory." Having certain shared patterns of marginalization justifies certain institutional mechanisms to guarantee presence.

Notes

Williams offers her understanding of representation as mediation as a supplement to what she regards as the traditional conception of liberal representation. Williams identifies two strands in liberal representation. The first strand she describes as the "ideal of fair representation as an outcome of free and open elections in which every citizen has an equally weighted vote" (1998, 57). The second strand is interest-group pluralism, which Williams describes as the "theory of the organization of shared social interests with the purpose of securing the equitable representation … of those groups in public policies" (*ibid.*). Together, the two strands provide a coherent approach for achieving fair representation, but the traditional conception of liberal representation as made up of simply these two strands is inadequate. In particular, Williams criticizes the traditional conception of liberal representation for failing to take into account the injustices experienced by marginalized groups in the United States. Thus, Williams expands accounts of political representation beyond the question of institutional design and thus, in effect, challenges those who understand representation as simply a matter of formal procedures of authorization and accountability.

Another way of re-envisioning representation was offered by Nadia Urbinati (2000, 2002). Urbinati argues for understanding *representation as advocacy*. For Urbinati, the point of representation should not be the aggregation of interests, but the preservation of disagreements necessary for preserving liberty. Urbinati identifies two main features of advocacy: 1) the representative's passionate link to the electors' cause and 2) the representative's relative autonomy of judgment. Urbinati emphasizes the importance of the former for motivating representatives to deliberate with each other and their constituents. For Urbinati the benefit of conceptualizing representation as advocacy is that it improves our understanding of deliberative democracy. In particular, it avoids a common mistake made by many contemporary deliberative democrats: focusing on the formal procedures of deliberation at the expense of examining the sources of inequality within civil society, e.g. the family. One benefit of Urbinati's understanding of representation is its emphasis on the importance of opinion and consent formation. In particular, her agonistic conception of representation highlights the importance of

disagreements and rhetoric to the procedures, practices, and ethos of democracy. Her account expands the scope of theoretical discussions of representation away from formal procedures of authorization to the deliberative and expressive dimensions of representative institutions. In this way, her agonistic understanding of representation provides a theoretical tool to those who wish to explain how non-state actors "represent."

Other conceptual advancements have helped clarify the meaning of particular aspects of representation. For instance, Andrew Rehfeld (2009) has argued that we need to disaggregate the delegate/trustee distinction. Rehfeld highlights how representatives can be delegates and trustees in at least three different ways. For this reason, we should replace the traditional delegate/trustee distinction with three distinctions (aims, source of judgment, and responsiveness). By collapsing these three different ways of being delegates and trustees, political theorists and political scientists overlook the ways in which representatives are often partial delegates and partial trustees.

Other political theorists have asked us to rethink central aspects of our understanding of democratic representation. In *Inclusion and Democracy* Iris Marion Young asks us to rethink the importance of descriptive representation. Young stresses that attempts to include more voices in the political arena can suppress other voices. She illustrates this point using the example of a Latino representative who might inadvertently represent straight Latinos at the expense of gay and lesbian Latinos (1986, 350). For Young, the suppression of differences is a problem for *all* representation (1986, 351). Representatives of large districts or of small communities must negotiate the difficulty of one person representing many. Because such a difficulty is constitutive of representation, it is unreasonable to assume that representation should be characterized by a "relationship of identity." The legitimacy of a representative is not primarily a function of his or her similarities to the represented. For Young, the representative should not be treated as a substitute for the represented. Consequently, Young recommends reconceptualising representation as *a* differentiated relationship (2000, 125–127; 1986, 357). There are two main benefits of Young's

understanding of representation. First, her understanding of representation encourages us to recognize the diversity of those being represented. Second, her analysis of representation emphasizes the importance of recognizing how representative institutions include as well as they exclude. Democratic citizens need to remain vigilant about the ways in which providing representation for some groups comes at the expense of excluding others. Building on Young's insight, Suzanne Dovi (2009) has argued that we should not conceptualize representation simply in terms of how we bring marginalized groups into democratic politics; rather, democratic representation can require limiting the influence of overrepresented privileged groups.

Moreover, based on this way of understanding political representation, Young provides an alternative account of democratic representation. Specifically, she envisions democratic representation as a dynamic process, one that moves between moments of authorization and moments of accountability (2000, 129) which makes the process 'democratic'. This fluidity allows citizens to authorize their representatives and for *traces* of that authorization to be evident in what the representatives do and how representatives are held accountable. The appropriateness of any given representative is therefore partially dependent on future behaviour as well as on his or her past relationships. For this reason, Young maintains that evaluation of this process must be continuously "deferred." We must assess representation dynamically, that is, assess the whole on-going processes of authorization and accountability of representatives. Young's discussion of the dynamic of representation emphasizes the ways in which evaluations of representatives are incomplete, needing to incorporate the extent to which democratic citizens need to suspend their evaluations of representatives and the extent to which representatives can face unanticipated issues.

Another insight about democratic representation that comes from the literature on descriptive representation is the importance of contingencies. Here the work of Jane Mansbridge on descriptive representation has been particularly influential. Mansbridge recommends that we evaluate descriptive representatives by contexts and certain functions. More specifically, Mansbridge (1999, 628) focuses on four

functions and their related contexts in which disadvantaged groups would want to be represented by someone who belongs to their group. Those four functions are "(1) adequate communication in contexts of mistrust, (2) innovative thinking in contexts of uncrystallized, not fully articulated, interests, … (3) creating a social meaning of 'ability to rule' for members of a group in historical contexts where the ability has been seriously questioned and (4) increasing the polity's de facto legitimacy in contexts of past discrimination." For Mansbridge, descriptive representatives are needed when marginalized groups distrust members of relatively more privileged groups and when marginalized groups possess political preferences that have not been fully formed. The need for descriptive representation is contingent on certain functions.

Mansbridge's insight about the contingency of descriptive representation suggests that at some point descriptive representatives might not be necessary. However, she doesn't specify how we are to know if interests have become crystallized or trust has formed to the point that the need for descriptive representation would be obsolete. Thus, Mansbridge's discussion of descriptive representation suggests that standards for evaluating representatives are fluid and flexible. For an interesting discussion of the problems with unified or fixed standards for evaluating Latino representatives, see Christina Beltran's The Trouble with Unity.

Mansbridge's discussion of descriptive representation points to another trend within the literature on political representation — namely, the trend to derive normative accounts of representation from the representative's function. Russell Hardin (2004) captured this trend most clearly in his position that "if we wish to assess the morality of elected officials, we must understand their function as our representatives and then infer how they can fulfil this function." For Hardin, only an empirical explanation of the role of a representative is necessary for determining what a representative should be doing. Following Hardin, Suzanne Dovi (2007) identifies three democratic standards for evaluating the performance of representatives: those of fair-mindedness, critical trust building, and good gate-keeping. In *Ruling Passions*, Andrew Sabl (2002) links the proper behaviour of representatives to their particular office. In particular, Sabl focuses on three offices: senator, organizer and activist.

He argues that the same standards should not be used to evaluate these different offices. Rather, each office is responsible for promoting democratic constancy, what Sabl understands as "the effective pursuit of interest." Sabl (2002) and Hardin (2004) exemplify the trend to tie the standards for evaluating political representatives to the activity and office of those representatives.

1.6 INDEPENDENT CANDIDATES AND POLITICAL REPRESENTATION IN INDIA

Independent candidates are generally thought to be unimportant for political representation. They have no formal affiliation with the established political parties that are the primary vehicles for representation in most democracies (Sartori 1968), and are rarely elected to represent the constituencies they contest (Ehin et al. 2013, Ch.4). The conclusion that they are unimportant for representation is problematic, however. The logic behind it focuses narrowly on the fact that elections are typically won by party rather than by independent candidates, and ignores the process by which electoral outcomes are generated. If independents appeal to some segment of the electorate, they can affect who turns out to vote, for whom voters vote, and who among the other candidates is elected to represent the constituency.

India is a useful context for several reasons. Like many other major democracies, India requires a money deposit for participation as a candidate in elections. At the same time India practices affirmative action in the amount candidates pay. The first deposits were set in 1947 at 500 Rupees for General candidates and 250 Rupees for Scheduled Castes or Tribes (SC/ST) candidates, and were left unchanged for 50 years.

Elections with large numbers of candidates (in 1000 candidates there must be one SC/ST candidate). The deposit increases had a disproportionate impact on participation by independents, as the number of independents decreased more in constituencies where the

deposit increased to 10,000 rupees, relative to constituencies where the deposit increased to 5,000 rupees. This exogenous variation in

participation by independents provides a powerful first stage for an instrumental variables-based identification strategy.

India is a parliamentary democracy with single-member districts. The national government is formed by the party, or coalition of parties, with the most elected representatives.

Voters vote for local representatives, and if the representative is a member of the governing coalition, then the constituency is represented directly in government. Coupling our instru- mental variables strategy with this feature let us investigate the effect of independents on Constituency representation in govt.

We show that a standard deviation increase in the number of independents increases voter turnout by 5-6 percentage points, increases the total vote share for independents by 9-10 percentage points, and reduces the vote share of the winner by about 5 percentage points. Independents thus induce some voters to vote rather than stay home, some to switch whom they vote for, and allow the winning candidate to win with support from a smaller segment of the electorate, ultimately suggesting that independents could affect the outcome of the election.

We show independents in fact decrease the probability of electing a governing-coalition representative by 27-30 percentage points. This finding implies that the price of participation by independents is constituency representation in government. We identify the parties who benefit from a loss by a governing-coalition candidate. India is an ethno-linguistically diverse democracy, and this diversity is reflected by the politics of case) are expensive to administer, as the Commission must print a book with the details of each candidate, and make it available free of charge to all citizens. As Indian democracy has matured, several ethnic and regional parties have emerged across the country. We show that independents increase the probability of an ethnic party winning the constituency by 12 percentage points. Consistent with winners being able to win with less vote share, ethnic parties, though more likely to win, see no change in their collective share of the vote. Finally, we show the probability of major national parties winning decreases almost one for one with the increase in the probability of ethnic parties winning, which suggests that the prospects for ethnic parties improve at the expense of National parties in particular.

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

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

6.   Discuss the advances of political representation.

_____

_____

7.   Discuss the roll of independent candidates of representation system.

_____

_____

1.7 LET US SUM UP

Theorists of representation differ not only in their definition of representation but also, among other things, on what the duties of a representative are, who can be called representative and how one becomes a representative.

Models of representation refer to ways in which elected officials behave in representative democracies. There are three main types: delegate, trustee, and politico

The Delegate Model of representation suggests that representatives have little or no capacity to exercise their own judgement or preferences.

A trustee is someone who acts on behalf of others, using their knowledge, experience and intelligence upon a certain field. The Trustee Model contrasts with the Delegate Model as this time constituents 'entrust' their elected representatives to represent them however they see fit, they are given autonomy to vote and behave in the best way for their constituents.

The Politico Model came about when theorists recognised that representatives rarely consistently act as just a delegate or just a trustee when representing their constituents. It is a hybrid of the two models discussed above and involves representatives acting as delegates and trustees, depending on the issue.

There are different concepts of what a representative should be and the duty which he owes to his electors. We divide them into four types: (1) The Mirror type; (2) The Chameleon type; (3) The Statesman type; and (4) The Party member type.

When the party is judged by the constituents at the general election and people vote for its programme, the unity of the party demands that members elected on its tickets must act in unison as disciplined adherents. Without such a code of conduct representative democracy cannot succeed.

We show independents in fact decrease the probability of electing a governing-coalition representative by 27-30 percentage points. This finding implies that the price of participation by independents is constituency representation in government.

We identify the parties who benefit from a loss by a governing-coalition candidate. India is an ethno-linguistically diverse democracy, and this diversity is reflected by the case of politics are expensive to administer, as the Commission must print a book with the details of each candidate, and make it available free of charge to all citizens. As Indian democracy has matured, several ethnic and regional parties have emerged across the country.

1.8 KEYWORDS

1.Significance : In the common view, **political representation** is assumed to refer only to the political activities undertaken, in representative democracies, by citizens elected to political office on behalf of their fellow citizens who do not hold political office.

2.Types/models : **Models of representation** refer to ways in which elected officials behave in representative democracies. There are three main types: delegate, trustee, and politico.

3.Contemporary advances: There have been a number of important advances in theorizing the concept of political representation.

4.Independent candidates: Independent candidates are generally thought to be unimportant for political representation.

1.9 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. Discuss the elements of representation.
2. Discuss the importance of substantive representation and Descriptive representation.
3. Discuss the three main types of representation.
4. Write a essay on 4 types of representatives.
5. Discuss the advances of political representation.

1.10 SUGGESTED READINGS AND REFERENCES

1. Carey, John M. and Matthew Soberg Shugart. (1995) "Incentives to Cultivate a Personal Vote: A Rank Ordering of Electoral Formulas." *Electoral Studies* vol 14(4): 417-439.

2. Huber, John D. and G. Bingham Powell, Jr. (1994) "Congruence Between Citizens and Policymakers in Two Visions of Liberal Democracy" *World Politics* vol. 46(April): 291-326.

3. Hill, Kim Quaile, Soren Jordan, and Patricia A. Hurley (2015) *Representation in Congress: A Unified Theory*. Cambridge University Press.

4. Hurley, Patricia A. (1982) "Collective Representation Reappraised" *Legislative Studies Quarterly* vol. VII(February): 119-136.

1.11 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. In **The Concept of Representation**, Pitkin identifies four distinct views of political representation that emerge in the political literature on the subject:

    I.   Formalistic Representation, including:

Authorization

Accountability

   II.   Symbolic Representation
  III.   Descriptive Representation, and
  IV.   Substantive Representation

Formalistic views of representation identify political representation with the formal procedures (e.g. elections) used in the selection of representatives. Pitkin distinguishes two formalistic views on political representation - the authorization and accountability views. Under the authorization view, a representative is an individual who has been authorized to act on the behalf of another or a group of others. Theorists who take the accountability view argue that a representative is an individual who will be held to account. Generally, the authorization and accountability views of political representation are discussed, separately or in combination, in the context of representative government.

The descriptive and symbolic views of political representation according to Pitkin describe the ways in which political representatives "stand for" the people they represent. Descriptive representatives "stand for" to the extent that they resemble, in their descriptive characteristics (e.g. race, gender, class etc.), the people they represent. On the other hand, Symbolic representatives "stand for" the people they represent as long as those people believe in or accept them as their representative.

Pitkin argues that these views of political representation give an inadequate account of political representation because they lack an account both of how representatives "act for" the represented and the normative criteria for judging representative's actions. Hence Pitkin

proposes a substantive view of representation. In this view of political representation, representation is defined as substantive "acting for", by representatives, the interests of the people they represent.

2.Under representative democracy, **substantive representation** (in contrast to descriptive representation) is the tendency of elected legislators to advocate on behalf of certain groups.

Conflicting theories and beliefs exist regarding why constituents vote for representatives. "Rather than choosing candidates on the basis of an informed view of the incumbents' voting records, voters, it is argued, rely primarily on the policy-free 'symbols' of party identification". Politicians, it would seem, have little to fear from a public that knows little about what laws their representatives support or oppose in the legislature.

Descriptive representation is the idea that elected representatives in democracies should represent not only the expressed preferences of their constituencies (or the nation as a whole) but also those of their descriptive characteristics that are politically relevant, such as geographical area of birth, occupation, ethnicity, or gender.

Sometimes voting systems that obtain proportional representation may achieve descriptive representation as well. However this can be guaranteed only to the extent that voting patterns reflect descriptive characteristics of the voters.

3.**Models of representation** refer to ways in which elected officials behave in representative democracies. There are three main types: delegate, trustee, and politico.

1.3.1

Delegate Model

A delegate is someone who is elected to represent and convey the views of others. The Delegate Model of representation suggests that representatives have little or no capacity to exercise their own judgement or preferences. They are merely elected to be the mouthpiece of their constituency and act only the way their constituents would want them to, regardless of their own suggestion. Joseph Tussman, stated "The essence of representation is the delegation or granting of authority. To authorize a

representative is to grant another the right to act for oneself. Within the limits of the grant of authority one is, in fact, committing himself in advance to the decision or will of another".

1.3.2

Trustee Model

A trustee is someone who acts on behalf of others, using their knowledge, experience and intelligence upon a certain field. The Trustee Model contrasts with the Delegate Model as this time constituents 'entrust' their elected representatives to represent them however they see fit, they are given autonomy to vote and behave in the best way for their constituents. Edmund Burke, who formulated the model stated in a speech "You choose a member indeed; but when you have chosen him he is not member of Bristol, but he is a member of parliament... your representative owes you, not his industry only, but his judgement; and he betrays, instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your own opinion".

1.3.3

Politico Model

The Politico Model came about when theorists recognised that representatives rarely consistently act as just a delegate or just a trustee when representing their constituents. It is a hybrid of the two models discussed above and involves representatives acting as delegates and trustees, depending on the issue.

4.**Other Models**

The Mandate Model views representatives as less independent actors. This came about after the emergence of modern political parties; now constituents rarely vote for a representative based on their personal qualities but more broadly, they vote for their party to be elected into government. A mandate is an order or instruction from a superior body therefore this model suggests representatives follow the party line and must carry out policies outlined during election campaigns.

The Resemblance Model is less concerned about the way representatives are selected and more concerned whether they resemble

the group they claim to represent. It is similar to descriptive representation, they argue that to represent a group of people such as the working class or women to its full potential you must be part of that social group yourself. Therefore, only people who have shared experiences and interests can fully identify with a particular issues.

5.There are different concepts of what a representative should be and the duty which he owes to his electors. We divide them into four types: (1) The Mirror type; (2) The Chameleon type; (3) The Statesman type; and (4) The Party member type.

The advocates of mirror type of representation explain that representatives should mirror or reflect the electorate they represent. They should be precisely like the people, rich and poor, farmers and industrialists, lawyers and merchants, teachers and medical men, landlords and tenants, in every representative assembly and exactly in proportion to the numerical strength of each class in the population of the **State**. For example, if two- thirds of the population is agricultural, then, the assembly should in that proportion consist of the farmers and others directly or indirectly engaged in agriculture. It is urged that common people representing other common people can best represent the will of the people and they are the best to tell the government what it cannot do and what the people will not stand. This is tantamount to what actually the body-politic could have done if they were to decide the problems themselves.

6.There have been a number of important advances in theorizing the concept of political representation. In particular, these advances call into question the traditional way of thinking of political representation as a principal-agent relationship. Most notably, Melissa Williams' recent work has recommended re-envisioning the activity of representation in light of the experiences of historically disadvantaged groups. In particular, she recommends understanding representation as "mediation." In particular, Williams (1998, 8) identifies three different dimensions of political life that representatives must "mediate:" the dynamics of legislative decision-making, the nature of legislator-constituent relations, and the basis for aggregating citizens into representable constituencies.

She explains each aspect by using a corresponding theme (voice, trust, and memory) and by drawing on the experiences of marginalized groups in the United States. For example, drawing on the experiences of American women trying to gain equal citizenship, Williams argues that historically disadvantaged groups need a "voice" in legislative decision-making. The "heavily deliberative" quality of legislative institutions requires the presence of individuals who have direct access to historically excluded perspectives.

7. Independent candidates are generally thought to be unimportant for political representation.

They have no formal affiliation with the established political parties that are the primary

vehicles for representation in most democracies (Sartori 1968), and are rarely elected to rep-

resent the constituencies they contest (Ehin et al. 2013, Ch.4). The conclusion that they are

unimportant for representation is problematic, however. The logic behind it focuses narrowly

on the fact that elections are typically won by party rather than by independent candidates,

and ignores the process by which electoral outcomes are generated. If independents appeal

to some segment of the electorate, they can affect who turns out to vote, for whom voters

vote, and who among the other candidates is elected to represent the constituency.

UNIT - 2: PARTY SYSTEM IN INDIA

2.0 OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you should be able to:

- recall the origin of party system

- explain the meaning and nature of political parties

- describe the functions of political parties

- evolution of Indian party system

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The role of party system in the operation of democratic polity is now generally well recognized by Political Scientists and politicians alike. Democracy, as Finer observes, "rests, in its hopes and doubts, upon the party system." In fact, as democracy postulates free organization of opposing opinions or 'hospitality to a plurality of ideas' and political

parties act as a major political vehicle of opinions and ideas, party system is the sine qua non of democracy. Without party, the electorate would be highly diffused and atomized, and opinions too variant and dispersed. The existence of party-system is, therefore, necessary to bring public opinion to focus and frame issues for tile popular verdict. It is, therefore, very useful and interesting for students of Comparative Politics to understand the origin, meaning, various kinds and merits and demerits of the party system.

2.2 ORIGIN OF THE PARTY SYSTEM

Political Scientists have offered several explanations for the origin of the party system. These explanations can be broadly clubbed under three categories as discussed below:

2.2.1 The Human Nature Theory

Under this category, three kinds of explanations have been put forward for explaining the origin of the party system. Firstly scholars like Sir Henry Main argue that what causes parties to rise is the characteristic tendency of human nature towards combativeness. In other words, human beings form parties to give organized expression to their combative instinct. The second category of explanation under the human nature theory. For instance, while persons having liking for the established order join right of the political divide, others opposing the existing order join left of the political spectrum. In other words, those who do not support change in existing system form one party, and those who want reforms and changes get together in another party.

2.2.2 Environmental Explanation

In addition to the above-mentioned explanations, considerable data is available to show the role of the socio- economic environment in the evolution of the party system. It is thus not surprising to find the historic

roots of the party system both in the struggle of the legislature to limit the king's prerogative and in the development of groups within the expanded electorate taking sides in the battle or demanding recognition of their interests.

2.2.3 Interest Theory

As usual, while the above-mentioned explanations are partly correct, no singl Explanation is adequate or completely true. Combativeness, for instance, is only one of the various motivations of human behaviour.

In view of the inadequacies of the aforesaid explanations regarding the origin of the party system, the "interest theory" is advanced as a widely recognized hypothesis. The nature, extent and degree of an individual's political activities are motivated by the range of interests he develops. These interests grow out of interactions of his/her personality with his/her cultural environment. While the 'interest theory' recognizes the significance of economic interests in influencing an individual or group's decision to join a particular party or combination of parties.

2.3 MEANING AND FUNCTION OF POLITICAL   PARTIES

In our country, there are several political parties that stand for the election. The presence of the political party is actually a healthy situation for the nation. It gives people a choice to make a more evolved and effective decision. Moreover, it drives the other political parties to get better than their competitors to win elections and rule the nation. A political party basically, is a group of people. These people come together to contest elections in order to hold power in the government. It is a way to mobilize voters to support common sets of interests, concerns, and goals. The primary role of the political party is to fix the political agenda and policies. So, each party tries to persuade people by claiming their policies are better than those of other parties. In a broader perspective, a political party is a means via which the people can speak to the government and have a say in

the governance of any country. So, every political party must have three key components:

- Leaders

- Active Members

- Followers

Functions of a Political Party

Every political party has a number of functions to perform. Here we have listed some of them.

- A political party contests elections by putting up candidates.

- In countries like the USA, the candidates are selected by members and supporters of a party.

- On the other hand, in countries like India, the candidates are chosen by top party leaders.

- Every party has different policies and programmes. Voters make a choice in accordance with the policies and programmes liked by them.

- In a democratic country, a large group of people that has certain similar opinions group together and form a party. Then then, give a direction to the policies adopted by the government.

- Those parties which lose elections form the opposition. They voice different views and criticise the government for their failures and mobilize opposition to the government.

- Political parties shape public opinion. With the help of the pressure groups, the parties launch movements for solving problems faced by the people.

- Parties even offer access to government machinery and welfare schemes. The local party leader serves as a link between the citizen and the government officer.

Party System

There are three types of party systems:

- One-Party System

- Two-Party System

- Multi-Party System

One-Party System

In a one-party system, there is no competition in this system. Here, the lone party nominates the candidates and the voters have only two choices i.e.

- Not to vote at all or

- write 'yes' or 'no' against the name of the candidates nominated by the party

Such a political system has been prominent in authoritarian regimes and communist countries such as China, North Korea, and Cuba. Before the collapse of communism, this system was also prevalent in USSR

Two-Party System

In a two-party system, the power shifts between two major, dominant parties. So, for winning the elections, the winner will have to get the maximum number of votes. However, please know that maximum number of votes is not equivalent to a majority of votes.

So, the smaller parties tend to merge with the bigger parties or they drop out of elections. Such a parliamentary system prevails in Canada and Great Britain, in which there are two parties holding the maximum numbers of seats.

Multi-Party System

The third and the most common form of government is the multi-party system. In such a system, there are three or more parties which have the capacity to gain control of the government separately or in a coalition.

In case, no party achieves a clear majority of the legislative seats, then several parties join forces and form a coalition government. Countries like India, follow a multi-party system..

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.   Discuss the origin of party system.

_____

_____

_____

2.   Discuss the role of political parties in a democracy.

_____

_____

3.   Discuss the various types of party system in India.

_____

_____

2.4 EVOLUTION OF THE PARTY SYSTEM

After independence was achieved, congress found itself without a unifying purpose. With R. Prasad as President of the country & P. Tandon as President of Congress there was a growing In 1948 Socialist Party was formed with J.P. Narayan & in 1951, KMPP (Kisan Majdoor Praja Party) with J.B. Kriplani. These parties accused Congress of betraying its commitment to the poor. They claimed to stand for the ideals of old Gandhian Congress. The party also faced external challenges from : 1. Jana Sangh which sought to consolidate India's largest religious grouping, the Hindus into one solid voting bank. 2. Hindu parties even more orthodox than Jana Sangh- Hindu Mahasabha & Ram Rajya Parishad. 3. CPI & its many splinter groups of the left. 4.

Regional parties based on affiliation of ethnicity & religion: Dravida Kazhagam (Tamil pride), Akalis in Punjab, Jharkhand Party demanding separate state for tribal's. •1951-52saw the first general election of India. These were the first ever polls to be held under the new constitution, drawn up with the British parliamentary system as a model. •However, the biggest let down of the polls was that about 176 million people were eligible to vote and an abysmally low figure of 15% amongst them were literate. •Congress passed the first litmus test of democracy by winning a landslide victory. The party won 364 of the 489 seats in the parliament. •Congress, however, suffered some unexpected setbacks in three southern states – Tamil Nadu (Madras), Andhra Pradesh (Hyderabad) and Kerala (Travancore) – where the party failed to win majority in the face of strong support of the Communist Party. •Nehru led Congress to another victory in the 1957 polls. •This time North India remained unchallenged for congress as Jana Sangh & socialists were in disarray due to departure of their charismatic leaders. •Rest of the country the challenges had increased multifold with: Gantantra Parishad in Orissa, Bombay, DMK in Tamil Nadu & CPI in Kerala gaining strength. •It was the first time a Communist party anywhere in the world won a democratic mandate. •Shortly before his death Ambedkar decided to float a new party named 'The Republic party' of India. In second election (1967) the picture radically changed. Of the 16 states, only eight returned to Congress to power with absolute majorities in the state legislatures. In Madras, the main issue that swept the Dravida Munnetra Khazagam to power was fear of the imposition of Hindi as the sole official language of India. In Punjab, the fall in Congress stock was largely due to squabbles attending the partition of the two states. In Uttar Pradesh and Delhi, the Jan Sangh gathered a large number of votes through its agitation against cow slaughter. Despite these regional issues and mounting popular disenchantment with its rule, Congress would not have fared as badly as it did had its own house been in order. Twenty years of uninterrupted enjoyment of power had made it smug and arrogant. One reflection of this could be seen in their uncompromising attitude towards the dissidents inside their party, the continued and relentless exclusion of the latter from all position of authority. The bitter infighting that followed this led to large-scale expulsions and

resignations and in West Bengal, Orissa and Bihar ex-Congressmen formed parties which contested the official Congress in the elections. In other states, where no such extreme development took place, Congressmen often allied secretly with opposition candidates to defeat candidates belonging to rival factions of their own party. Bangla Congress, Jana Congress, and Swatantra Party gained big in this period. The first three parties were breakaway units of the Congress and shared much of its moderate approach to social and economic issues; Swatantra Party was different in that it did not believe in economic planning. But then it was not communal and did not have any extra-territorial loyalty like the Communists. Their emergence as important political parties could have been said to be very hopeful sign for Indian democracy.

As a consequence of these factors the Indian Party system is unique. It does not fit into generally prescribed types of one-party, two party, multi-party systems etc. Since independence the system has passed through various stages of growth:

(i) 1952-64 the epoch of national consensus-the Nehru Era;

(ii) 1964-69- the uneasy transition marked by the emergence of a multi-party situation;

(iii) 1969- 75—the period of new consensus and of increasing inter-party conflict;

(iv) 1975-77—the Emergency authoritarian period

(v) 1977-80—the Janata phase of coalitional politics ;

(vi) 1980-89—the new phase of tussle between the Congress in the Centre and the regional parties in the states;

(vii) since 1989 the situation showed a clear trend of decline of Congress hegemony and emergence of multi- Party system and a coalitionist phase,

(viii) Era of Coalition government.

2.5 DYNAMICS OF THE INDIAN PARTY

The nature and dynamics of the party system in India are unique. Indian politics represents the spectacle of a multiparty system on the surface; but for long periods of modern India's electoral history, it has been characterised by "one dominant party system" with congress occupying the center stage. Since 1970s Indian party system has become highly competitive both at the center as well as in the states. This competitiveness has significantly made the political parties to move from the stage of "fluidity" during the early years to that of a structural consolidation. The bewildering pluralities of political formations and interests have been developed into full-fledged political parties, with unique models of social engineering. A notable feature of the electoral outcomes since 1989 has been the fractured mandate leading to the emergence of hung parliament as well as multi-party coalitions. After analysing the changing profile of the Indian party system, this article makes a prognosis reflecting the end of the era of single party governments in the wake of the formation of multi-party coalitions at the national level and also in several states.

2.6 A CRITIQUE OF THE PARTY SYSTEM

In recent years the party system has become the object of much criticism almost everywhere. Firstly, under this system the perpetual struggle for political power turns the legislature into a battle field and in the process national interests are ignored. Secondly, it encourages insincerity as specious issues are often raised to divert public attention. Thirdly, parties tend to become autonomous in the sense that principles and national interests are subordinated for the sake of winning elections. Fourthly, parties unnecessarily extend national political issues to local elections. Fifthly, the practice of rewarding party members, known as the spoils system in the US, constitutes dereliction from principles. Sixthly, "party spirit is accused of debasing the moral standards", as scruples are sacrificed at the altar of party interest. Seventhly, as parties have to mobilise funds for contesting elections, they have to reward the donors after winning the elections leading to corruption. Finally, parties are

often run by leaders and their small cliques in the name of masses thereby frustrating the will of the people for better government.

2.7 WHETHER PARTY-LESS DEMOCRACY IS POSSIBLE?

Political parties are indispensable in Modern democracies. If democracy is regarded as a government by the people, then political parties must be accepted as a necessary institution. Parties act as the major political vehicle of opinions and ideas by framing issues for popular verdict. Parties also bridge economic and geographic gaps of sectionalism and seek a compromise on public policy. Besides, parties are eminent educators as they bring down political issues to the common people. The party system also ensures responsibility as the opposition parties keep a constant vigil on the government. Parties are thus the only means through which the people, who are ultimate political sovereign, can control the government. The party system alone provides a method of securing a change of government by constitutional and peaceful means. That is why, despite the strong disliking of the framers of the American Constitution, party system emerged in the US within a few years of its operation. The talk of party-less democracy advocated by Indian leaders like Jay Prakash Narayan is nothing but autopia.

The Statesman report: "All political parties in India are rogue entities. The Constitution of India, adopted on 26 November 1949 not by "we the people" but by the Constituent Assembly set up by our colonial rulers on 16 May 1946, accepted adult franchise, the most powerful instrument devised by man for breaking down social and economic injustice, but did not recognise political parties. The makers of the Constitution envisaged a party-less democracy. BR Ambedkar, Chairman of the Drafting Committee of the Constituent Assembly, said on 4 November 1948 while introducing the draft Constitution for debate, "Constitutional morality is not a natural sentiment. It has to be cultivated. We must realise that our people have yet to learn it. Democracy in India is only top-dressing on Indian soil which is essentially undemocratic."

The Indian National Congress was a movement engaged in freedom struggle. Ignoring Mahatma Gandhi's advice to dissolve it after

independence, leaders of the Congress, made up of people holding views from the far right to the left, converted the movement into a political party with the sole purpose of grabbing power. The party lacked constitutional or legal validity. To make matters worse, over the years it introduced the principle of hereditary succession. Most of the political parties that came after the Congress followed suit. From the Abdullahs of Kashmir to Karunanidhi of Kanyakumari they have established minor political dynasties. Thomas Paine in his immortal book, Rights of Man, wrote: "When the mind of a nation is bowed down by hereditary succession, it loses a considerable portion of its powers…Hereditary succession requires the same obedience to ignorance as to wisdom; and when once the mind can bring itself to pay this indiscriminate reverence, it descends below the statue of mental manhood. It is fit to be great only in little things."

Section 29A of the Representation of the People Act allows for small groups of people to form political parties by making a simple declaration. The result is the proliferation of parties with no political ideology or programme. More than 1,200 political parties are registered with the Election Commission. When it comes to elections, less than one-third of them participate. Collecting government advertisements for their 'official' organ or publication is one of their major sources of income. During elections many of these parties get into the fray only to withdraw in favour of one of the mainstream parties for a price. No political parties, including the Congress and the BJP, hold proper internal elections or publish their audited accounts. Two years ago the Central Information Commission decided that the Right to Information Act was applicable to all political parties, in keeping with the spirit of democracy. The Congress, which enacted the RTI Act, joined the rest in opposing it tooth and nail.

The National Committee to Review the Working of the Constitution headed by former Chief Justice MN Venkatachaliah, the Law Commission headed by Justice Jeevan Reddy, and the National Election Watch and the Association for Democratic Reform were unanimous that Parliament should enact a law to regulate the constitution, functioning,

funding, accounts, audit and other affairs concerning political parties and participation in elections. The existence of political parties is now implicit though the Constitution did not provide for it. High cost of elections, corrupt electoral practices, abuse of money power to the extent of paying for votes and dynastic control of political parties have resulted in erosion of democracy and its essential values. The time has come to make political parties democratic, transparent, accountable and open to scrutiny by regulating their conduct and affairs like holding periodical election of their office-bearers and publishing their annual audited accounts as public limited companies are mandated to do. The need for comprehensive legislation to strengthen political parties has been felt for quite some time. Neither the BJP nor the Congress has shown any interest in such legislation. The NCRWC in its report to the NDA government headed by the BJP stressed the desirable objective of promoting "progressive polarisation of political ideologies" with a view to weeding out less serious political activity. While proliferation of smaller parties created confusion, any tightening of regulation must take into account "the need to reflect the aspirations of a plural society," the report said.

The committee recommended that the Election Commission should progressively increase the threshold criterion for eligibility for recognition so that the proliferation of smaller parties was discouraged. It also wanted rules and by-laws of the parties seeking registration should include provisions for a declaration of adherence to democratic values and norms of the Constitution in their inner-party organisations and a declaration to shun violence for political gains. Another recommendation was that parties should not resort to casteism and communalism for political mobilisation. However laudable these recommendations are, the government was not prepared to concede the demand of the Election Commission to amend Section 29A of the RP Act by adding a clause authorising the commission to issue necessary orders regulating registration and de-registration of political parties. The Election and Other Related Laws (Amendment) Bill introduced in the LokSabha on 19 March 2002 sought to introduce Section 29D to the RP Act. The Parliamentary Standing Committee on Home Affairs recommended

deletion of the entire Section 29D in Clause 2 of the Bill. It may be recalled that LK Advani was the Home Minister then. The Law Commission in its 1999 report recommended amending the RP Act to insert a new Section 78A requiring maintenance, audit and publication of accounts by political parties. To enforce compliance of Section 78A, certain penalties were suggested. It too was shot down by the Home Ministry.

Another important recommendation of the NCRWC was the setting up of special Election Benches in High Courts designated to hear only election petitions and dispose them within a time-frame not exceeding six months. The Second Administrative Reforms Commission, in its report "Ethics in Governance," also echoed the same sentiments. The report said: "Special Election Tribunals should be constituted at the regional level under Article 329B of the Constitution to ensure speedy disposal of election petitions and disputes within a stipulated period of six months." In practice, however, cases involving election petitions are rarely resolved in a timely manner. Such petitions remain pending for years and in the meanwhile even the full term of the House expires, thus rendering the petitions infructuous.

For instance, in the 2009 Lok Sabha election in Sivaganga the final round of counting showed Raja Kannapan of the AIADMK was leading by 7,034 votes against P Chidambaram of the Congress. After half an hour of heated exchanges in the counting hall, Chidambaram was declared elected. Aggrieved Kannappan filed an election petition in the Madras High Court on 25 June 2009. By seeking adjournment after adjournment, Chidambaram completed his full term of five years as Union Home and Finance Minister. Kannapan's election petition is still pending in the High Court, notwithstanding Sections 86(6) and 86(7) of the RP Act which state the High Court shall dispose of an election petition within six months. Since the political parties do not want to be brought under any law or discipline, the Association for Democratic Reforms in association with the National Election Watch prepared a draft legislation titled "The Political Parties (Registration and Regulation)

Bill" and submitted it to the UPA government in 2011. It was ignored. The BJP too has no intention of bringing forward such legislation.

Rule of law is essential for the protection of human rights. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1948, is the Magna Carta of mankind. The Supreme Court in its landmark judgment in the Keshavan and Bharti case instructed that there are certain essential features of the Constitution which cannot be amended by Parliament even by the requisite majority. The law must have a certain core component which guarantees the basic human rights and dignity of every person. The First Republic of India has spent itself in the last 64 years without achieving that goal. The time has come for a new Constitution rectifying the shortcomings of the existing one to usher in the Second Republic.

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

4.	Examine the critique of the party system.

_____

_____

_____

5.	Explain why party-less democracy is not possible.

_____

_____

_____

6.	Discuss the various stages of party system growth.

_____

_____

2.8 LET US SUM UP

Political Scientists have offered several explanations for the origin of the party System Under this category, three kinds of explanations have been put forward for explaining the origin of the party system. Firstly scholars like Sir Henry Main argue that what causes parties to rise is the characteristic tendency of human nature towards combativeness. In other words, human beings form parties to give organized expression to their combative instinct. country, there are several political parties that stand for the election. The presence of the political party is actually a healthy situation for the nation. It gives people a choice to make a more evolved and effective decision. every political party must have three key components:

- Leaders

- Active Members

- Followers

Functions of a Political Party

- Political parties shape public opinion. With the help of the pressure groups, the parties launch movements for solving problems faced by the people.

- Parties even offer access to government machinery and welfare schemes. The local party leader serves as a link between the citizen and the government officer.

There are three types of party systems:

- One-Party System

- Two-Party System

- Multi-Party System

Finally, parties are often run by leaders and their small cliques in the name of masses thereby frustrating the will of the people for better government. Constitution which cannot be amended by Parliament even by the requisite majority. The law must have a certain core component

which guarantees the basic human rights and dignity of every person. The First Republic of India has spent itself in the last 64 years without achieving that goal. The time has come for a new Constitution rectifying the shortcomings of the existing one to usher in the Second Republic.

After independence was achieved, congress found itself without a unifying purpose. With R. Prasad as president of the country & P. Tandon as president of Congress there was a growing Hindu tint of the party, which led to departure of some of its most effervescent leaders.

2.9 KEYWORDS

Origins of the political party system: Political Scientists have offered several explanations for the origin of the party

Function of the political party: In our country, there are several political parties that stand for the election. The presence of the political party is actually a healthy situation for the nation.

Different types of party system: There are three types of party systems.

Critique of the party system: In recent years the party system has become the object of much criticism almost everywhere.

Evolution of the party system: Their emergence as important political parties could have been said to be very hopeful sign for Indian democracy.

2.10 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. Discuss the role of political parties in a democracy.
2. Discuss the origin of party system.
3. Discuss the various types of party system in India.
4. Examine the drawbacks of the party system.
5. Explain why party-less democracy is not possible.
6. Discuss the various stages of growth.

2.11 SUGGESTED READINGS AND REFERENCES

1. M. Duverger, **Political Parties**(New York: Wiley. 1954)

2. Jean Blondel, A**n Introduction to Comparative Government** (London: Weiden Fed

   and Nicolson, 1969)

3. S. E. Finer, C**omparative Government**(London: Allen Lane, The Penguin Press,

   1970)

4. H. Eckstein and David E. Apter, **Comparative politics** (London, 1963)

5. Roy C. Macridis and Bernard Brown, **Comparative politics** (Dorsey, 1964)

2.12 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. Political Scientists have offered several explanations for the origin of the party

system. These explanations can be broadly clubbed under three categories as

discussed below:

2.2.1 The Human Nature Theory

Under this category, three kinds of explanations have been put forward for explaining the origin of the party system. Firstly scholars like Sir Henry Main argue that what causes parties to rise is the characteristic tendency of human nature towards combativeness. In other words, human beings form parties to give organized expression to their combative instinct.

The second category of explanation under the human nature theory.

For instance, while persons having liking for the established order join

right of the political divide, others opposing the existing order join left of the political spectrum. In other words, those who do not support change in existing system form one party, and those who want reforms and changes get together in another party.

Third explanation concerning the human nature of origin of parties runs in terms of the charismatic traits of political leaders.

2.2.2 Environmental Explanation

In addition to the above-mentioned explanations, considerable data is available to show the role of the socio- economic environment in the evolution of the party system. It is thus not surprising to find the historic roots of the party system both in the struggle of the legislature to limit the king's prerogative and in the development of groups within the expanded electorate taking sides in the battle or demanding recognition of their interests.

2.2.3 Interest Theory

As usual, while the above-mentioned explanations are partly correct, no single Explanation is adequate or completely true. Combativeness, for instance, is only one of the various motivations of human behaviour.

In view of the inadequacies of the aforesaid explanations regarding the origin of the party system, the "interest theory" is advanced as a widely recognized hypothesis. The nature, extent and degree of an individual's political activities are motivated by the range of interests he develops. These interests grow out of interactions of his/her personality with his/her cultural environment.

While the 'interest theory' recognizes the significance of economic interests in influencing an individual or group's decision to join a particular party or combination of parties.

2. **Functions of a Political Party**

Every political party has a number of functions to perform. Here we have listed some of them.

- A political party contests elections by putting up candidates.

- In countries like the USA, the candidates are selected by members and supporters of a party.

- On the other hand, in countries like India, the candidates are chosen by top party leaders.

- Every party has different policies and programmes. Voters make a choice in accordance with the policies and programmes liked by them.

- In a democratic country, a large group of people that has certain similar opinions group together and form a party. Then then, give a direction to the policies adopted by the government.

- Those parties which lose elections form the opposition. They voice different views and criticise the government for their failures and mobilize opposition to the government.

- Political parties shape public opinion. With the help of the pressure groups, the parties launch movements for solving problems faced by the people.

- Parties even offer access to government machinery and welfare schemes. The local party leader serves as a link between the citizen and the government officer.

3. There are three types of party systems:

- One-Party System

- Two-Party System

- Multi-Party System

One-Party System

In a one-party system, there is no competition in this system. Here, the one party nominates the candidates and the voters have only two choices i.e.

- Not to vote at all or

- write 'yes' or 'no' against the name of the candidates nominated by the party

Such a political system has been prominent in authoritarian regimes and communist countries such as China, North Korea, and Cuba. Before the collapse of communism, this system was also prevalent in USSR

Two-Party System

In a two-party system, the power shifts between two major, dominant parties. So, for winning the elections, the winner will have to get the maximum number of votes. However, please know that maximum number of votes is not equivalent to a majority of votes.

So, the smaller parties tend to merge with the bigger parties or they drop out of elections. Such a parliamentary system prevails in Canada and Great Britain, in which there are two parties holding the maximum numbers of seats.

Multi-Party System

The third and the most common form of government is the multi-party system. In such a system, there are three or more parties which have the capacity to gain control of the government separately or in a coalition.

In case, no party achieves a clear majority of the legislative seats, then several parties join forces and form a coalition government. Countries like India, follow a multi-party system. Some people are of the view, that a multi-party system often leads to political instability in a country.

4. In recent years the party system has become the object of much criticism almost everywhere. Firstly, under this system the perpetual

struggle for political power turns the legislature into a battle field and in the process national interests are ignored. Secondly, it encourages insincerity as specious issues are often raised to divert public attention. Thirdly, parties tend to become autonomous in the sense that principles and national interests are subordinated for the sake of winning elections. Fourthly, parties unnecessarily extend national political issues to local elections. Fifthly, the practice of rewarding party members, known as the spoils system in the US, constitutes dereliction from principles. Sixthly, "party spirit is accused of debasing the moral standards", as scruples are sacrificed at the altar of party interest. Seventhly, as parties have to mobilise funds for contesting elections, they have to reward the donors after winning the elections leading to corruption. Finally, parties are often run by leaders and their small cliques in the name of masses thereby frustrating the will of the people for better government.

5.political parties are indispensable in Modern democracies. If democracy is regarded as a government by the people, then political parties must be accepted as a necessary institution. Partics act as the major political vehicle of opinions and ideas by framing issues for popular verdict. Parties also bridge economic and geographic gaps of sectionalism and seek a compromise on public policy. Besides, parties are eminent educators as they bring down political issues to the common people. The party system also ensures responsibility as the opposition parties keep a constant vigil on the government. Parties are thus the only means through which the people, who are ultimate political sovereign, can control the government. The party system alone provides a method of securing a change of government by constitutional and peaceful means.

The Statesman report:

All Political Parties in India are rogue entities. The Constitution of India, adopted on 26 November 1949 not by "we the people" but by the Constituent Assembly set up by our colonial rulers on 16 May 1946, accepted adult franchise, the most powerful instrument devised by man for breaking down social and economic injustice, but did not recognise political parties. The makers of the Constitution envisaged a party less democracy. BR Ambedkar, chairman of the drafting committee of the

Constituent Assembly, said on 4 November 1948 while introducing the draft Constitution for debate, "Constitutional morality is not a natural sentiment. It has to be cultivated. We must realise that our people have yet to learn it. Democracy in India is only top-dressing on Indian soil which is essentially undemocratic."

The Indian National Congress was a movement engaged in freedom struggle. Ignoring Mahatma Gandhi'sadvice to dissolve it after independence, leaders of the Congress, made up of people holding views from the far right to the left, converted the movement into a political party with the sole purpose of grabbing power. The party lacked constitutional or legal validity. To make matters worse, over the years it introduced the principle of hereditary succession. Most of the political parties that came after the Congress followed suit. From the Abdullahs of Kashmir to Karunanidhi of Kanyakumari they have established minor political dynasties. Thomas Paine in his immortal book, Rights of Man, wrote: "When the mind of a nation is bowed down by hereditary succession, it loses a considerable portion of its powers. Hereditary succession requires the same obedience to ignorance as to wisdom; and when once the mind can bring itself to pay this indiscriminate reverence, it descends below the statue of mental manhood. It is fit to be great only in little things."

6. As a consequence of these factors the Indian Party system is unique. It does not fit into generally prescribed types of one-party, two party, multi-party systems etc. Since independence the system has passed through various stages of growth:

(i) 1952-64 the epoch of national consensus-the Nehru Era;

(ii) 1964-69- the uneasy transition marked by the emergence of a multi-party situation;

(iii) 1969- 75—the period of new consensus and of increasing inter-party conflict;

(iv) 1975-77—the Emergency authoritarian period

(v) 1977-80—the Janata phase of coalitional politics ;

(vi) 1980-89—the new phase of tussle between the Congress in the Centre and the regional parties in the states;

(vii) Since 1989 the situation showed a clear trend of decline of Congress hegemony and emergence of multi- Party system and a coalitionist phase,

(viii) Era of Coalition government.

UNIT - 3: SINGLE PARTY TO DOMINANT AND MULTI PARTY SYSTEM

STRUCTURE

3.0   OBJECTIVES

After studying this unit, you should be able to:

- Concept of political parties
- Different party system
- Dominant party system and multi-party system
- Comparison with other party system

3.1 INTRODUCTION

A political party basically, is a group of people. These people come together to contest elections in order to hold power in the government. It is a way to mobilize voters to support common sets of interests, concerns, and

goals. The primary role of the political party is to fix the political agenda and policies. So, each party tries to persuade people by claiming their policies are better than those of other parties. In a broader perspective, a political party is a means via which the people can speak to the government and have a say in the governance of any country. So, every political party must have three key components:

- Leaders

- Active Members

- Followers

3.2 CONCEPT OF POLITICAL PARTIES

In our country, there are several political parties that stand for the election. The presence of the political party is actually a healthy situation for the nation. It gives people a choice to make a more evolved and effective decision. Moreover, it drives the other political parties to get better than their competitors to win elections and rule the nation. One-party states explain themselves through various methods. Most often, proponents of a one-party state argue that the existence of separate parties runs counter to national unity. Others argue that the one party is the vanguard of the people, and therefore its right to rule cannot be legitimately questioned. The Soviet government argued that multiple parties represented the class struggle, which was absent in Soviet society, and so the Soviet Union only had one party, namely the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Some one-party states only outlaw opposition parties, while allowing allied parties to exist as part of a permanent coalition such as a popular front. However, these parties are largely or completely subservient to the ruling party and must accept the ruling party's monopoly of power as a condition of their existence. Examples of this are the People's Republic of China under the United Front, the National Front in former East Germany and the Democratic Front for the Reunification of Korea in North Korea. Others may allow non-party members to run for

legislative seats, as was the case with Taiwan's Tangwai movement in the 1970s and 1980s, as well as the elections in the former Soviet Union. Within their own countries, dominant parties ruling over one-party states are often referred to simply as the Party. For example, in reference to the Soviet Union, the Party meant the Communist Party of the Soviet Union; in reference to the pre-1991 Republic of Zambia, it referred to the United National Independence Party.

Most one-party states have been ruled by parties forming in one of the following three circumstances:

1. an ideology of Marxism–Leninism and international solidarity (such as the Soviet Union for most of its existence)
2. some type of nationalist or fascist ideology (such as Italy under Benito Mussolini)
3. parties that came to power in the wake of independence from colonial rule. One-party systems often arise from decolonization because a single party gains an overwhelmingly dominant role in liberation or in independence struggles.

One-party states are usually considered to be authoritarian, to the extent that they are occasionally totalitarian. On the other hand, not all authoritarian or totalitarian states operate upon one-party rule. Some, especially amongst absolute monarchies and military dictatorships, have no need for a ruling party, and therefore make all political parties illegal. The term "communist state" is sometimes used in the West to describe states in which the ruling party subscribes to a form of Marxism–Leninism. However, such states may not use that term themselves, seeing communism as a phase to develop after the full maturation of socialism, and instead use descriptions such as "people's republic", "socialist republic", or "democratic republic". One peculiar example is Cuba where, despite the role of the Communist Party being enshrined in the constitution, no party, including the Communist Party, is permitted to campaign or run candidates for elections. Candidates are elected on an individual referendum basis without formal party involvement, although elected assemblies predominantly consist of members of the Communist Party alongside non-affiliated candidates.

Multiple-party systems are featured by the presence of a fairly large number of parties with compete with one another on relatively equal terms. Several parties may be considerably in comparison with their minor competitors, but they lack the strength of the major parties under a genuine two-party system. None of them is basically able to muster sufficient voting strength to capture control of government. Among the numerous countries in Europe and elsewhere with multiple-party systems, the case of France probably is the best known

because of the international importance of France as one of the leading powers and because of the frequency with which its coalition cabinets have been forced to resign. Due to increasing pressures for democratization in many the 21st century many African countries were forced to accept multi-party systems for example Kenya, Zimbabwe, Zambia Malawi, Angola, Mozambique, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ghana, Nigeria and so on.

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.   Discuss the concept of the political party.

_____

_____

_____

2.   Discuss the meaning of one party system and multi-party system.

_____

_____

3.3 PARTY SYSTEMS

A democracy cannot exist without the presence of a political party. This is clear from the function performed by the political parties. In case, there are no political parties then:

- Every candidate in the election would be an independent candidate. Any individual candidate does not have the efficiency to promise any major policy change to the people. In such a scenario, no one will be responsible for how the country is run.

- In the long run, only a representative democracy can survive. Political parties are the agencies that gather different views on various issues and present them to the government.

Party System

There are three types of party systems:

- One-Party System

- Two-Party System

- Multi-Party System

3.3.1 One-Party System

In a one-party system, there is no competition in this system. Here, the lone party nominates the candidates and the voters have only two choices i.e.

- Not to vote at all or

- write 'yes' or 'no' against the name of the candidates nominated by the party

Such a political system has been prominent in authoritarian regimes and communist countries such as China, North Korea, and Cuba. Before the collapse of communism, this system was also prevalent in USSR.

3.3.2 Two-Party System

In a two-party system, the power shifts between two major, dominant parties. So, for winning the elections, the winner will have to get the maximum number of votes. However, please know that maximum number of votes is not equivalent to a majority of votes.

So, the smaller parties tend to merge with the bigger parties or they drop out of elections. Such a parliamentary system prevails in Canada and Great Britain, in which there are two parties holding the maximum numbers of seats.

3.3.3 Multi-Party System

The third and the most common form of government is the multi-party system. In such a system, there are three or more parties which have the capacity to gain control of the government separately or in a coalition.

In case, no party achieves a clear majority of the legislative seats, then several parties join forces and form a coalition government. Countries like India, follow a multi-party system. Some people are of the view, that a multi-party system often leads to political instability in a country.

3.4 DOMINANT PARTY SYSTEM AND MULTI PARTY SYSTEM

A **dominant-party system**, or **one-party dominant system**, is a system where there is "a category of parties/political organisations that have successively won election victories and whose future defeat cannot be envisaged or is unlikely for the foreseeable future." Many are *de facto* one-party systems, and often devolve into *de jure* one-party systems. Usually, the dominant party consistently holds majority government, without the need for coalitions.

Examples commonly cited include: United Russia (EP) in Russia,

the Justice and Development Party (AKP) in Turkey, Serbian Progressive

Party (SNS) in Serbia, Democratic Party of Socialists of

Montenegro (DPS) in Montenegro, the People's Action Party (PAP)

in Singapore, the African National Congress (ANC) in South Africa,

the Liberal Democratic Party in Japan, Awami

League in Bangladesh, MPLA in Angola, the ZANU–

PF in Zimbabwe, Chama Cha Mapinduzi in Tanzania and the Cambodian

People's Party in Cambodia.

3.4.1 Historical overview

Opponents of the "dominant party" system or theory argue that it views the meaning of **democracy** as given, and that it assumes that only a particular conception of **representative democracy** (in which different parties alternate frequently in power) is valid. One author argues that "the dominant party 'system' is deeply flawed as a mode of analysis and lacks explanatory capacity. But it is also a very conservative approach to politics. Its fundamental political assumptions are restricted to one form of democracy, electoral politics and hostile to popular politics. This is manifest in the obsession with the quality of electoral opposition and its side lining or ignoring of popular political activity organised in other ways. The assumption in this approach is that other forms of organisation and opposition are of limited importance or a separate matter from the consolidation of their version of democracy."

One of the dangers of dominant parties is "the tendency of dominant parties to conflate party and state and to appoint party officials to senior positions irrespective of their having the required qualities." However, in some countries this is common practice even when there is no dominant party. In contrast to **one-party systems**, dominant-party systems can occur within a context of a democratic system. In a one-party system other parties are banned, but in dominant-party systems other political parties are tolerated, and (in democratic dominant-party systems) operate without overt legal impediment, but do not have a realistic chance of winning; the dominant party genuinely wins the votes of the vast majority of voters every time (or, in authoritarian systems, claims to). Under authoritarian dominant-party systems, which may be referred to as "soft authoritarianism", **opposition** parties are legally allowed to operate, but are too weak or ineffective to seriously challenge power, perhaps through various forms of **corruption**, constitutional quirks that intentionally undermine the ability for an effective opposition to thrive, institutional and/or organizational conventions that support the status quo, occasional but not omnipresent **political repression**, or inherent cultural values averse to change.

In some states opposition parties are subject to varying degrees of official harassment and most often deal with restrictions on free speech

(such as press laws), lawsuits against the opposition, and rules or electoral systems (such as **gerrymandering** of electoral districts) designed to put them at a disadvantage. In some cases outright **electoral fraud** keeps the opposition from power. On the other hand, some dominant-party systems occur, at least temporarily, in countries that are widely seen, both by their citizens and outside observers, to be textbook examples of democracy. An example of a genuine democratic dominant-party system would be the pre-**Emergency India**, which was almost universally viewed by all as being a democratic state, even though the only major national party at that time was the **Indian National Congress**. The reasons why a dominant-party system may form in such a country are often debated: supporters of the dominant party tend to argue that their party is simply doing a good job in government and the opposition continuously proposes unrealistic or unpopular changes, while supporters of the opposition tend to argue that the electoral system disfavours them (for example because it is based on the principle of **first past the post**), or that the dominant party receives a disproportionate amount of funding from various sources and is therefore able to mount more persuasive campaigns. In states with ethnic issues, one party may be seen as being the party for an ethnicity or race with the party for the majority ethnic, racial or religious group dominating, e.g., the **African National Congress** in **South Africa** (governing since 1994) has strong support amongst Black South Africans and the **Ulster Unionist Party** governed **Northern Ireland** from its creation in 1921 until 1972 with the support of the **Protestant** majority.

Sub-national entities are often dominated by one party due the area's demographic being on one end of the spectrum. For example, the current elected government of the **District of Columbia** has been governed by **Democrats** since its creation in the 1970s, **Bavaria** by the **Christian Social Union** since 1957, **Madeira** by the **Social Democrats** since 1976, and **Alberta** by **Progressive Conservatives** from 1971–2015. On the other hand, where the dominant party rules nationally on a genuinely democratic basis, the opposition may be strong in one or more subnational areas, possibly even constituting a dominant party locally; an example is South Africa, where although the **African National**

Congress is dominant at the national level, the opposition **Democratic Alliance** is strong to dominant in the Province of Western Cape.

A multi-party system is a political system in which multiple political parties across the political spectrum run for national election, and all have the capacity to gain control of government offices, separately or in coalition. Apart from one-party-dominant and two-party systems, multi-party systems tend to be more common in parliamentary systems than presidential systems and far more common in countries that use proportional representation compared to countries that use first-past-the-post elections. Several parties compete for power and all of them, have reasonable chance of forming government.

First-past-the-post requires concentrated areas of support for large representation in the legislature whereas proportional representation better reflects the range of a population's views. Proportional systems may have multi-member districts with more than one representative elected from a given district to the same legislative body, and thus a greater number of viable parties. Duverger's law states that the number of viable political parties is one, plus the number of seats available in the given district.

Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Croatia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Kosovo, Lebanon, Maldives, Mexico, Moldova, Nepal, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Taiwan, Tunisia and Ukraine are examples of nations that have used a multi-party system effectively in their democracies. In these countries, usually no single party has a parliamentary majority by itself. Instead, multiple political parties are compelled to form compromised coalitions for the purpose of developing power blocks and attaining legitimate mandate.

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

3.   Discuss the historical overview of Dominant party system.

_____

_____

_____

4.   Briefly discuss the multi party system in political parties.

_____

_____

3.5 COMPARISON WITH OTHER PARTY SYSTEMS

A system where only two parties have the possibility of winning an election is called two-party system. A system where only three parties have a *realistic possibility* of winning an election or forming a coalition is sometimes called a "Third-party system". But, in some cases the system is called a "Stalled Third-Party System," when there are three parties and all three parties win a large number of votes, but only two have a chance of winning an election. Usually this is because the electoral system penalizes the third party, e.g. as in Canadian or UK politics. In the 2010 elections, the Liberal Democrats gained 23% of the total vote but won less than 10% of the seats due to the first-past-the-post electoral system. Despite this, they still had enough seats (and enough public support) to form coalitions with one of the two major parties, or to make deals in order to gain their support. An example is the Conservative-Liberal Democrat coalition formed after the 2010 general election. Another is the Lib-Lab pact during Prime Minister James Callaghan's Minority Labour Government; when Labor lost its three-seat majority in 1977, the pact fell short of a full coalition. In Canada, there are three major federal political parties; the Conservative Party of Canada, the Liberal Party of Canada, and the New Democratic Party of Canada (also known as the NDP). The NDP is currently in alliance with another party, the Green Party of

Canada. However, the Liberals and Conservatives have been the only two parties to form government in Canada with the New Democrats as the third party, except in the 2011 Canadian election when the New Democrats were the Official Opposition.

Unlike a one-party system (or a two-party system), a multi-party system encourages the general constituency to form multiple distinct, officially recognized groups, generally called political parties. Each party competes for votes from the enfranchised constituents (those allowed to vote). To vote in most countries, you must be at least 18 years old or older. A multi-party system prevents the leadership of a single party from controlling a single legislative chamber without challenge, as we have learned that one party should not have too much power, lest they try to take over.

If the government includes an elected Congress or Parliament, the parties may share power according to proportional representation or the first-past-the-post system. In proportional representation, each party wins a number of seats proportional to the number of votes it receives. In first-past-the-post, the electorate is divided into a number of districts, each of which selects one person to fill one seat by a plurality of the vote. First-past-the-post is not conducive to a proliferation of parties, and naturally gravitates toward a two-party system, in which only two parties have a real chance of electing their candidates to office. Proportional representation, on the other hand, does not have this tendency, and allows multiple major parties to arise. But, recent coalition governments, such as that in the U.K., represent two-party systems rather than multi-party systems. This is regardless of the number of parties in government.

A two-party system needs voters to align themselves in large blocs, sometimes so large that they cannot agree on any overarching principles. Some theories argue that this allows centrists to gain control. On the other side, if there are multiple major parties, each with less than a majority of the vote, the parties are strongly motivated to work together to form working governments. This also promotes centrism, as well as promoting coalition-building skills while discouraging polarization.

3.6 DYNAMICS OF THE INDIAN PARTY

The nature and dynamics of the party system in India are unique. Indian politics represents the spectacle of a multiparty system on the surface; but for long periods of modern India's electoral history, it has been characterised by "one dominant party system" with congress occupying the center stage. Since 1970s Indian party system has become highly competitive both at the center as well as in the states. This competitiveness has significantly made the political parties to move from the stage of "fluidity" during the early years to that of a structural consolidation. The bewildering pluralities of political formations and interests have been developed into full-fledged political parties, with unique models of social engineering. A notable feature of the electoral outcomes since 1989 has been the fractured mandate leading to the emergence of hung parliament as well as multi-party coalitions. After analysing the changing profile of the Indian party system, this article makes a prognosis reflecting the end of the era of single party governments in the wake of the formation of multi-party coalitions at the national level and also in several states.

3.7 RELATIVE MERITS OF PARTY SYSTEMS

Opinion differs as to whether a two-party system if preferable to the multiple variety. An apparent advantage of the former is that one party normally gains complete control of the government and therefore may proceed to carry out its programme with a minimum of difficulty. Government is more stable and effective if a single party, rather than a coalition of parties, is placed in charge of governmental operations. Major compromises on questions of policy are reached within the two principal parties prior to election time and afterwards as well. As a result the policy-determination process within the government takes place more expeditiously and more smoothly than would be the case if compromises had to be worked out among many minority parties in the legislature. Moreover, the single party in power can be held wholly responsible for

results by the voters who may shift their support to the other major party if dissatisfied with the way governmental powers are exercised. Since one party operates the government and the other furnishes an apparently undivided opposition, the electorate has a comparatively simple choice to make whenever election occur. Two programmes, presumably different from each other, are offered the voters. Consequently issues are less confused than if many parties are striving to sell their wares to the public. From the voter's stand point, a multiple party system is advantageous in as much as he is more likely to find a party to which he can give whole-hearted support. He is not forced to make what may be his approval. Under a two-party system he may, of course, have the opportunity to vote for some minor party, but he realizes that a vote cast for such a party is really wasted because minor parties are hopelessly out of the running and cannot gain control of the government. For this reason he is likely to cast a reluctant vote for one of the two major parties. Another point in favour of a multiple party system is that the inevitable compromises which are involved in the determination of governmental policy take place somewhat openly within the legislature rather that more or less obscurely within the parties. The fact that compromises occur is more apparent to the general public if they are reached within instead of outside the legislature. Moreover, there may be less "behind the scenes" lobbying on the part of pressure groups at the seat of government if major interest groups are organizedas parties and function as such under a multiple party system. It is observed that, the majority of African political parties which were former liberation movements are reluctant to accept the existence of other political parties for example, Zimbabwe, Malawi, Mozambique and to some extent Democratic Republic of Congo.

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

5.   Discuss the comparisons with other party systems.

_____

_____

_____

6.   Write a note on party systems in political parties.

_____

_____

_____

3.8 LET US SUM UP

In our country, there are huge political parties that stand for the election. Some, especially amongst absolute monarchies and military dictatorships, have no need for a ruling party, and therefore make all political parties illegal. Multiple-party systems are featured by the presence of a fairly large number of parties with compete with one another on relatively equal terms. Several parties may be considerably in comparison with their minor competitors, but they lack the strength of the major parties under a genuine two-party system. None of them is basically able to muster enough voting strength to capture control of government. A **dominant-party system**, or **one-party dominant system**, is a system where there is "a category of parties/political organisations that have successively won election victories and whose future defeat cannot be envisaged or is unlikely for the foreseeable future. The nature and dynamics of the party system in India are unique. Indian politics represents the spectacle of a multiparty system on the surface; but for long periods of modern India's electoral history, it has been characterised by "one dominant party system" with congress occupying the centre stage. Since 1970s Indian party system has become highly competitive both at the centre as well as in the states. Opinion differs as to whether a two-party system if preferable to the multiple variety. An apparent advantage of the former is that one party normally gains complete control of the government and therefore may proceed to

carry out its programme with a minimum of difficulty. Government is more stable and effective if a single party, rather than a coalition of parties, is placed in charge of governmental operations. Major compromises on questions of policy are reached within the two principal parties prior to election time and afterwards as well. As a result the policy-determination process within the government takes place more expeditiously and more smoothly than would be the case if compromises had to be worked out among many minority parties in the legislature.

3.9 KEYWORDS

- Concept : In our country, there are several political parties that stand for the election. The presence of the political party is actually a healthy situation for the nation.

- Party systems : A democracy cannot exist without the presence of a political party. This is clear from the function performed by the political parties.

- Dominant and multi party system: A **dominant-party system**, or **one-party dominant system**, is a system where there is "a category of parties/political organisations that have successively won election victories and whose future defeat cannot be envisaged or is unlikely for the foreseeable future."

- A multi-party system is a political system in which multiple political parties across the political spectrum run for national election, and all have the capacity to gain control of government offices, separately or in coalition.

- Historical overview: Opponents of the "dominant party" system or theory argue that it views the meaning of democracy as given, and that it assumes that only a particular conception of representative democracy (in which different parties alternate frequently in power) is valid.

3.10 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. Discuss the concept of the political party.

2. Discuss the meaning of one party system and multi party system.

3. Discuss the comparisons with other party systems.

4. Write a note on party systems in political parties.

5. Discuss the historical overview of Dominant party system.

6. Briefly discuss the multi party system in political parties.

3.11 SUGGESTED READINGS AND REFERENCES

[1] S. D. Bailey, ed., Political Parties and the Party System in Britain (New York: Fredrick A. Praeger, 1956).

[2] D. W. Brogan, An Introduction to American Politics, 3rd ed. (London: Blackwell's, 1954).

[3] I. Bulmer-Thomas, The Party System in Great Britain (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1953).

[4] H. Finer, Governments of Greater European Powers (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1956), pp. 58-97, 335 – 367, 853 – 888.

[5] W. Goodman, The Two-Party System in the United States (Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Co., 1956).

[6] R. T. McKenzie, British Political Parties (London: Blackwell's 1954).

[7] S. Neumann, ed., Modern Political Parties (Chicago: Chicago University

3.12 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. In our country, there are huge political parties that stand for the election. The presence of the political party is actually a healthy situation for the nation. It gives people a choice to make a more evolved and effective decision. Moreover, it drives the other political parties to get better than their competitors to win elections and rule the nation. One-party states explain themselves through various methods. Most often, proponents of a one-party state argue that the existence of separate parties runs counter to

national unity. Others argue that the one party is the vanguard of the people, and therefore its right to rule cannot be legitimately questioned. The Soviet government argued that multiple parties represented the class struggle, which was absent in Soviet society, and so the Soviet Union only had one party, namely the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

2. One-party states are usually considered to be authoritarian, to the extent that they are occasionally totalitarian. On the other hand, not all authoritarian or totalitarian states operate upon one-party rule. Some, especially amongst absolute monarchies and military dictatorships, have no need for a ruling party, and therefore make all political parties illegal. The term "communist state" is sometimes used in the West to describe states in which the ruling party subscribes to a form of Marxism–Leninism. However, such states may not use that term themselves, seeing communism as a phase to develop after the full maturation of socialism, and instead use descriptions such as "people's republic", "socialist republic", or "democratic republic".

Multiple-party systems are featured by the presence of a fairly large number of parties with compete with one another on relatively equal terms. Several parties may be considerably in comparison with their minor competitors, but they lack the strength of the major parties under a genuine two-party system. None of them is basically able to muster sufficient voting strength to capture control of government. Among the numerous countries in Europe and elsewhere with multiple-party systems, the case of France probably is the best known.

3.Opponents of the "dominant party" system or theory argue that it views the concept of democracy as given, and that it assumes that only a particular conception of representative democracy (in which different parties alternate frequently in power) is valid. One author argues that "the dominant party 'system' is deeply flawed as a mode of analysis and lacks explanatory capacity. But it is also a very conservative approach to politics. Its fundamental political assumptions are restricted to one form of democracy, electoral politics and hostile to popular politics. This is manifest in the obsession with the quality of electoral opposition and its

side lining or ignoring of popular political activity organised in other ways. The assumption in this approach is that other forms of organisation and opposition are of limited importance or a separate matter from the consolidation of their version of democracy."

One of the dangers of dominant parties is "the tendency of dominant parties to conflate party and state and to appoint party officials to senior positions irrespective of their having the required qualities." However, in some countries this is common practice even when there is no dominant party. In contrast to one-party systems, dominant-party systems can occur within a context of a democratic system. In a one-party system other parties are banned, but in dominant-party systems other political parties are tolerated, and (in democratic dominant-party systems) operate without overt legal impediment, but do not have a realistic chance of winning; the dominant party genuinely wins the votes of the vast majority of voters every time (or, in authoritarian systems, claims to). Under authoritarian dominant-party systems, which may be referred to as "soft authoritarianism", opposition parties are legally allowed to operate, but are too weak or ineffective to seriously challenge power, perhaps through various forms of corruption, constitutional quirks that intentionally undermine the capacity for an effective opposition to thrive, institutional and/or organizational conventions that support the status quo, occasional but not omnipresent political repression, or inherent cultural values averse to change.

In some states opposition parties are subject to varying degrees of official harassment and most often deal with restrictions on free speech (such as press laws), lawsuits against the opposition, and rules or electoral systems (such as gerrymandering of electoral districts) designed to put them at a disadvantage. In some cases outright electoral fraud keeps the opposition from power. On the other side, some dominant-party systems occur, at least temporarily, in countries that are widely seen, both by their citizens and outside observers, to be textbook examples of democracy. An example of a genuine democratic dominant-party system would be the pre-Emergency India, which was almost universally viewed by all as being a democratic state, even though the only major national party at that time was the Indian National Congress. The reasons why a dominant-party system may form in such a country

are often debated: supporters of the dominant party tend to argue that their party is simply doing a good job in government and the opposition continuously proposes unrealistic or unpopular changes, while supporters of the opposition tend to argue that the electoral system disfavours them (for example because it is based on the principle of first past the post), or that the dominant party receives a disproportionate amount of funding from various sources and is therefore able to mount more persuasive campaigns.

4.A multi-party system is a political system in which multiple political parties across the political spectrum run for national election, and all have the capacity to gain control of government offices, separately or in coalition. Apart from one-party-dominant and two-party systems, multi-party systems tend to be more common in parliamentary systems than presidential systems and far more common in countries that use proportional representation compared to countries that use first-past-the-post elections. Several parties compete for power and all of them, have reasonable chance of forming government.

First-past-the-post requires concentrated areas of support for large representation in the legislature whereas proportional representation better reflects the range of a population's views. Proportional systems may have multi-member districts with more than one representative elected from a given district to the same legislative body, and thus a greater number of viable parties. Duverger's law states that the number of viable political parties is one, plus the number of seats available in the given district.

Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Croatia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Kosovo, Lebanon, Maldives, Mexico, Moldova, Nepal, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Taiwan, Tunisia and Ukraine are examples of nations that have used a multi-party system effectively in their democracies. In these countries, usually no single party has a parliamentary majority by itself. Instead, multiple political parties are compelled to form compromised coalitions

for the purpose of developing power blocks and attaining legitimate mandate.

5.A system where only two parties have the possibility of winning an election is called two-party system. A system where only three parties have a *realistic possibility* of winning an election or forming a coalition is sometimes called a "Third-party system". But, in some cases the system is called a "Stalled Third-Party System," when there are three parties and all three parties win a large number of votes, but only two have a chance of winning an election. Usually this is because the electoral system penalizes the third party, e.g. as in Canadian or UK politics. In the 2010 elections, the Liberal Democrats gained 23% of the total vote but won less than 10% of the seats due to the first-past-the-post electoral system. Despite this, they still had enough seats (and enough public support) to form coalitions with one of the two major parties, or to make deals in order to gain their support. For an example is the Conservative-Liberal Democrat coalition formed after the 2010 general election. Another is the Lib-Lab pact during Prime Minister James Callaghan's Minority Labour Government; when Labour lost its three-seat majority in 1977, the pact fell short of a full coalition. In Canada, there are three major federal political parties; the Conservative Party of Canada, the Liberal Party of Canada, and the New Democratic Party of Canada (also known as the NDP). The NDP is currently in alliance with another party, the Green Party of Canada. However, the Liberals and Conservatives have been the only two parties to form government in Canada with the New Democrats as the third party, except in the 2011 Canadian election when the New Democrats were the Official Opposition.

Unlike a one-party system (or a two-party system), a multi-party system encourages the general constituency to form multiple distinct, officially recognized groups, generally called political parties. Each party competes for votes from the enfranchised constituents (those allowed to vote). To vote in most countries, you must be at least 18 years old or older. A multi-party system prevents the leadership of a single party from controlling a single legislative chamber without challenge, as we have

understood that one party should not have too much power, lest they try to take over.

6.**One-Party System**

In a one-party system, there is no competition in this system. Here, the lone party nominates the candidates and the voters have only two choices i.e.

- Not to vote at all or

- write 'yes' or 'no' against the name of the candidates nominated by the party

Such a political system has been prominent in authoritarian regimes and communist countries such as China, North Korea, and Cuba. Before the collapse of communism, this system was also prevalent in USSR.

Two-Party System

In a two-party system, the power shifts between two major, dominant parties. So, for winning the elections, the winner will have to get the maximum number of votes. However, please know that maximum number of votes is not equivalent to a majority of votes.

So, the smaller parties tend to merge with the bigger parties or they drop out of elections. Such a parliamentary system prevails in Canada and Great Britain, in which there are two parties holding the maximum numbers of seats.

Multi-Party System

The third and the most common form of government is the multi-party system. In such a system, there are three or more parties which have the capacity to gain control of the government separately or in a coalition.

In case, no party achieves a clear majority of the legislative seats, then several parties join forces and form a coalition government. Countries

like India, follow a multi-party system. Some people are of the view, that a multi-party system often leads to political instability in a country.

The nature and dynamics of the party system in India are unique. Indian politics represents the spectacle of a multiparty system on the surface; but for long periods of modern India's electoral history, it has been characterised by "one dominant party system" with congress occupying the center stage. Since 1970s Indian party system has become highly competitive both at the center as well as in the states. This competitiveness has significantly made the political parties to move from the stage of "fluidity" during the early years to that of a structural consolidation.

UNIT - 4: REGIONAL AND STATE PARTIES

STRUCTURE

4.0 OBJECTIVES

After studying this unit, you should be able to:

- Concept of State Parties
- List of all state parties
- Concept of Regional Parties
- The decline and fall of regional parties

4.1 INTRODUCTION

India has a multi-party system, where political parties are classified as national, state or regional level parties. The status of party is accorded by the Election Commission of India, and the same is reviewed occasionally. All parties are registered with the Election Commission. A special and unique election symbol is given to every registered party by the Election Commission.

The Election Commission has laid down certain criteria for a party to be recognised as national or state level parties.

State Party

A party has to live up to at least one of the following qualifications to be acknowledged as a state party.

- The party has to win at least three seats or three per cent of the seats in the state legislative Assembly.
- It has to win minimum one seat in the Lok Sabha for every 25 seats or any fraction allotted to that concerned state.
- In a particular election, the party has to bag at least six per cent of the total votes, and also win one Lok Sabha and two Assembly seats.
- The status of a state party can still be bestowed upon an entity even if it fails to win any seats in the Lok Sabha or the Assembly, if it manages to win at least eight per cent of the total votes cast in the entire state.

Regional Parties in India

It wouldn't be an overstatement to say that politics in India is dictated by regional parties. These smaller parties hold considerable clout in individual states, leading to a highly fragmented vote distribution. As a result, political alliances and surprise moves are a common spectacle, as governments are formed and dissolved unanticipated. The sentiment was echoed by West Bengal Chief Minister Mamata Banerjee before the 2014 elections, who said that the mainstream parties were "zero", and that the future of India would be decided by regional political parties. Looking at the political history of India, there can be no doubt that regional parties are indeed the trump card. Below you will find the list of all regional political parties of India.

4.2 CONCEPT OF STATE PARTIES

A party has to fulfil any of the following conditions for recognition as a state party:

1. A party should win minimum three percent of the total number of seats or a minimum of three seats in the Legislative Assembly.

2. A party should win at least one seat in the Lok Sabha for every 25 seats or any fraction thereof allotted to that State.

3. A party should secure at least six percent of the total valid votes polled during general election to a Lok Sabha or State Legislative Assembly and should, in addition, win at least one Lok Sabha, and two Legislative Assembly seats in that election,

4. Under the liberalized criteria, one more clause that it will be eligible for recognition as state party if it secures 8%or more of the total valid votes polled in the state, addition to one seat in any state.

4.2.1 List of all political parties

As of April 2019 the number of national parties in India are 7, the number of state recognised parties are 35 and Regional Parties in India are around 329. A party should win at least 1 seat in the Lok Sabha for every 25 seats or any fraction there of allotted to that State or a party should win minimum 3% of the total number of seats or a minimum of 3 seats in the Legislative Assembly.

Criteria to become State Party;

If a political party want to become a state party then it has to fulfil at least one of the following criteria;

A. A party should win at **least 1 seat in the Lok Sabha for every 25 seats** or any fraction there of allotted to that State. **or**

B. A party should win **minimum 3% of the total number of seats or a minimum of 3 seats** in the Legislative Assembly. **or**

C. In a particular election, the party has to win **at least 6% of the total votes,** and also win 1 Lok Sabha and 2 Assembly seats. **or**

D. If a Party fails to win any seat in a State in a general election of Lok Sabha or Legislative Assembly of the State, the party will still be eligible

for recognition as State Party if it **secures 8%** or more of the total valid votes polled in the State.

Name of state Party	State	Abbreviation
1. AamAadmi Party	Delhi	AAP
2. Arunachal Congress	Arunachal Pradesh	AC
3. All India Anna Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam	Tamil Nadu	AIADMK
4. AsomGanaParishad	Assam	AGP
5. All India Forward Bloc	West Bengal	AIFB
6. Assam United Democratic Front	Assam	AUDF
7. Biju Janata Dal	Odisha	BJD
8. DravidaMunnetra Kazhagam	Tamil Nadu and Puducherry	DMK
9. Indian National Lok Dal	Haryana	INLD
10. Janata Dal (Secular)	Karnataka and Kerala	JD(S)
11. Janata Dal (United)	Bihar and Jharkhand	JD(U)
12. Jammu and Kashmir National Conference	Jammu & Kashmir	JKN
13. Jammu & Kashmir National Panthers Party	Jammu and Kashmir	JKNPP

14. Jammu & Kashmir Peoples Democratic Party	Jammu and Kashmir	JKPDP
15. Jharkhand MuktiMorcha	Jharkhand	JMM
16. Kerala Congress	Kerala	KEC
17. Kerala Congress (M)	Kerala	KEC(M)
18. Lok Jan Shakti Party	Bihar	LJP
19. MaharashtrawadiGomantak	Goa	MAG
20. MarumalarchiDravidaMunnetraKazhagam	Tamil Nadu and Puducherry	MDMK
21. Manipur Peoples Party	Manipur	MPP
22. Muslim League Kerala State Committee	Kerala	MUL
23. Nagaland Peoples Front	Nagaland and Manipur	NPF
24. PattaliMakkalKatchi	Tamil Nadu	PMK
25. RashtriyaJanata Dal	Bihar	RJD
26. Revolutionary Socialist Party	West Bengal	RSP
27. ShiromaniAkali Dal	Punjab	SAD
28. Sikkim Democratic Front	Sikkim	SDF

29. United Goans Democratic Party	Goa	UGDP
30. Shivsena	Maharasht ra	SHS
31. Samajwadi Party	Uttar Pradesh	SP
32. Telugu Desam	Andhra Pradesh	TDP
33. TelanganaRashtraSamithi	Andhra Pradesh	TRS
34. United Democratic Party	Meghalaya	UDP
35. UttarakhandKranti Dal	Uttarakhan d Himalayas	UKKD

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.   Discuss the concept of State Parties.

_____

_____

_____

2.   Name 20 State Parties in India with abbreviation.

_____

_____

_____

4.3 CONCEPT OF REGIONAL PARTIES

Regional parties are parties whose main holds are in one certain state and mostly they participate in the elections only within that state. Most of these regional parties have agenda fitting certain culture dominant within that state. Some of these regional parties also participate in neighbouring states, which have constituencies with culture similar to the first state. Different state parties were established at different periods because of different reasons. Some even have origins prior to India's independence.

In Tamil Nadu in south India, two main state parties are All India Anna Dravida Munnetra Kazagham (AIADMK) and Dravida Munnetra Kazagham (DMK). Of these two parties the DMK is the veteran party. The origins of these parties are prior to India's independence. The main ideology of this party is Tamil national pride. Before India's independence there were two Dravidian parties. One was Independent Party, which demand an independent Dravidstan in south India. Other was Justice Party, which had a Dravidian pride ideology. After India's independence, the Dravida Munnetra Kazagham (DMK) was established from the merger of these two parties in the former state of Madras, in south India. Later on the demand was changed to independent Tamil state. Finally this party compromised on a Tamil Nadu state within the Indian Union.

In the beginning this party was anti-north Indian. They opposed to any entrance of any kind of cultures of north India. They specially attacked the strive to introduce Hindi language in Tamil Nadu (see also Official languages of India). This party members also saw in the Tamili Brahmans agents of north India who immigrated to south India to enforce to north Indian Aryan culture on the south Indians (see Aryans and Dravidians). The party demanded to reserve the government jobs for Dravidians and not to 'immigrant' Brahmans. In 1972 this party split and a new party was founded by MC Ramachandaran and it was named All India Anna Dravida Munnetra Kazagham (AIADMK). In 1987 Ramachandaran died and Jayalalita inherited him. In the last few years these Tamilian pride parties have moderated their ideologies and before

the 1998 elections the AIADMK even cooperated with BJP, which is think about as a north Indian party.

In Andra Pradesh, also in south India, Telegu Desam was founded in 1982 by Telegu film actor, NT Rao. The ideology of the party is similar to the ideology of the AIADMK, which is local cultural pride. In the Telugu Desam case, the local cultural pride is of Telugu culture.

Another one state party is Akali Dal and its main hold is in Punjab, north India. This party is think about a state party, but actually it is a religion oriented party whose followers are the Sikhs. This party also has its origin prior to India's independence. Before independence this party demanded from the British a separate entity for the Sikhs in Punjab. During the independence period these demands were delayed for a while. After independence this party began demanding special status for the Sikh culture and the Punjabi language. They struggled for a Punjabi state with a Sikh majority within the Indian Union and recognition of Punjabi as a distinct language. They succeeded in forming the establishment of Punjab in 1966, but it had a very small majority of the Sikhs (see Internal map of India). But they also succeeded in obtaining the recognition of Punjabi as a distinct language and not as a dialect of Hindi (see Official languages of India). Later on the Akali Dal broke up into some factions. Some of the militant factions of the Akali Dal demanded an independent Sikh state to be called Khalistan. otherwise the dominant Akali Dal faction in Punjab wants Punjab to be a part of Indian Union.

In Assam in east India and in Maharashtra in west India there are political parties which came into existence because of the discriminatory feelings of the local 'sons of soil' population.

In British India, Assam was a British province. For some period the British attached Assam to the neighbouring Bengal province. During this period the Bengalis held many senior government posts. Later on Assam again became a separate province, but the government posts were still hold by the Bengalis. In the 1960s and the 1970s many Bengali oriented people immigrated to Assam. In the 1980s the Asom Gana Parishad was founded with an agenda to give back Assam to the Assamese people.

In Maharashtra, in west India, the local population is known as Maharashtrians. Their language is known as Marathi. Sometimes the Maharashtrians are also known as Marathi. The capital of Maharashtra is Mumbai, formerly Bombay. During the British rule, the city of Bombay was the capital of Bombay State. The Bombay State included in it regions of present day Maharashtra and present day Gujarat. The main language of Gujarat is Gujarati. The Gujaratis are the business communities of India. The city of Bombay was the business center of India. Many business communities from Gujarat settled in Bombay and were the important business community of Bombay. But the majority of the population of Bombay was Marathi and they were the working classes of the city. Many Indians from all around India also immigrated to Bombay to find a better future. This made Bombay the largest Indian cosmopolitan.

In 1960 Bombay State was divided into Maharashtra and Gujarat. Bombay the cultural capital of the Marathis and the Gujaratis was made capital of Maharashtra. After Maharashtra was established, a general feeling among many Marathis, was that Bombay is ruled and governed by 'foreigners'. Their main targets were not the Gujarati business communities, but immigrants who arrived from all over India and settled in Bombay. So these people established the Shiv Sena party. This party which began as a protest movement of the Marathis in Bombay, slowly became popular all around Maharashtra. This party ideology was spiced with Hindu-Marathi nationalist pride. Its rivals consider this party as a fanatic and anti-Muslim party. According to the party policy, many places in Maharashtra were renamed with Marathi oriented names. For example Bombay was renamed back to its original name Mumbai.

There are other state parties in India. To name a few there are, National Conference in Kashmir, Haryana Vikas Party in Haryana, Manipur People's Party in Manipur, Maharashtrawadi Gomantak in Goa, Sikkim Democratic Front in Sikkim, Mizo National Front in Mizoram, and many other parties. People who broke away from larger national parties, like the Congress founded some state parties. For example the West Bengal

Trinamul Congress, Tamil Manila Congress, Kerala Congress. There are also communist state parties.

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.   Discuss the concept of regional parties.

_____

_____

_____

2.   Give some examples of state parties in India.

_____

_____

_____

4.4 RISE OF REGIONAL PARTIES

In a democracy, political parties provide an agency to the society to gather different views on various issues and to present these to the government. They bring various representatives together so that a responsible government could be formed. They provide a mechanism to support or restrain the government, make policies, justify or oppose them. **India has a multi-party system.**

Political Parties in India

- Every political party in India has to register with the **Election Commission.**

- The Election Commission registers political parties for the purpose of elections and grants them **recognition as national or state parties** on the basis of their poll performance

- **Recognised Parties:**

- o Are given a unique symbol – only the official candidates of that party can use that election symbol

- o **National Parties:** A party that secures at least 6% of the total votes in LokSabha elections or Assembly elections in four States and wins at least four seats in the Lok Sabha is recognised as a national party.

- o **State Parties:** A party that secures at least 6% of the total votes in an election to the Legislative Assembly of a State and wins at least two seats is recognised as a State party.

- According to the **Election Commission of India,** there are **over 2000 political parties in India, which include eight "recognized national" and more than 50 "recognized state"** parties.

Regional Parties in India

- Other than the **8 national parties-** Indian National Congress, Bharatiya Janata Party, Nationalist Congress Party, Communist Parties, Bahujan Samaj Party, Rashtriya Janata Dal, All India Trinamool Congress and National People's Party; most of the major parties of the country are classified by the Election Commission as **'State parties'. These are commonly referred to as regional parties.**

- Yet these parties need not be regional in their ideology or outlook. Some of these parties are all India parties that happen to have succeeded only in some states.

- The presence of a number of **ethnic, cultural, linguistic, religious and caste groups** within the Indian society is greatly responsible for the origin and growth of regional parties.

- In India regional parties are based on themes like– **Identity, Statehood, Autonomy and Development etc.**

- o **Autonomy** consists of demanding greater powers to the states (like the National Conference in Jammu and Kashmir).

- o **Statehood** consists of fighting for an independent state within the country (like the Telangana Rastra Samiti demanded a separate state of Telangana).

- o **Identity** consists of fighting for recognition of cultural rights of a group (like the Shiv Sena in Maharashtra or the DMK fighting for the identity of the Dalits).

- o **Development** consists of regional parties believing that only they can bring development to the people of a particular region.

- o Sometimes regional parties create these **'cultural specificities'** for **electoral gains.**

Evolution of Regional Party

- Over the last four decades, the number and strength of regional parties has expanded.

- This has made the Parliament of India **politically more diverse.** Regional political parties have emerged to **fulfil regional aspirations.**

- No one national party is able to secure on its own a majority in Lok Sabha. As a result, the national parties are compelled to form alliances with State parties. The regional political parties started playing a crucial role in coalition politics since 1989.

- It is because of the regional political parties that our **party-system has been federalized.** The Centre has begun to address their problems and respond their aspirations through accommodation.

- The evolving nature of our party system has **strengthened the cooperative trends of our federal system.**

Various Stages of Indian Party System

1952-64 : The Nehruvian era of national consensus

The Congress Party was the dominant party and Indian democracy was essentially a **one party system** also **termed as 'Congress system'.**

- Congress evolved as the party that was like a **big umbrella** under which all communities and interests and ideologies sought and got a place.

- There were **many small parties competing with the Congress** but they acted mainly **as a kind of pressure groups.**

1964-77: An Uneasy Transition

- With the **death of Jawahar Lal Nehru,** and **1967 elections** posed challenge to dominance of the congress system.

The Congress **failed to secure majorities in eight states** and its majority in the LokSabha was reduced to very narrow 54% of the seats.

- **Regional parties started growing all over the country.**

- The dismal performance of the Congress led to a series of **power struggles with in congress.**

- Ultimately, the party was split in 1969 and Indira Gandhi's supremacy was established both in the party and the government.

- However, some leaders like Morarji Desai in Gujarat and JP (Jaiprakash Narain) in Bihar carried out a **successful movement against Congress** corruption and arbitrary rule.

- Their movement peaked in 1975 when **Indira Gandhi for the first and only time in Indian history decided to impose in internal emergency.**

1977-80: A Period of a New Consensus and Increasing Inter-Party Conflict

- New coalition emerged led by **Janata Party** in 1977.

- This led to **Emergence of a Multi-Party System in India.**

- Many **smaller parties** had come together to fight the Congress dominance rather than any ideological consensus.

- But, the lack of ideologically coherent policy led to **fall of Janata party** and congress gained rise of power in 1980.

1980-89: Tussle between the Congress at the centre and the newly emerged regional parties at the state level

- Frivolous use of **President's rule under Article 356.**

- However, the regional parties got strengthened and started playing a more assertive role in centre politics.

In the eighth Lok Sabha Elections (1984), **the Telugu Desam**, a regional party of Andhra Pradesh, **emerged as the main opposition party.**

1989 to 2014: Multi-party system and Coalition politics

- The death of Rajiv Gandhi, corruption cases (Bofors scandal), economic crisis, all set the tone for an **era of coalitions** that has lasted for almost **twenty five years** of coalition governments.

- The **modern era of coalition politics** has come into being as a consequence of the **development of the multi-party system.**

- However, this period is marred by **compulsions of coalition.**

  o Growth of Regional Parties also lead to **'rainbow' coalitions,** so called because like the rainbow, they last only a short time.

The period of 1996 – 1999 had 3 general elections, which cost a lot of public money.

  o **Policy paralysis** and delay in decision making and bills all result from coalitions.

In times of emergency, coalition coordination can lead to **unacceptable delays.**

  o Coalition government can **obstruct the process of decision making** and the conduct of decision implementation.

  o Coalition government has turned politics of north India into one of **competition for vote banks** based on caste and community etc.

- **On the contrary,** during times of coalitions, regional parties served as a **moderating force upon exclusionary national parties.**

  o Regional parties fill a vacuum for **protecting minorities.**

  o The coalition politics has led to empowerment for regional parties from the states and has added to India's search for **true federalism.**

Thus, it paves the way for a kind of **'electoral federalism'.**

  o Since 1996, twenty three regional parties have been sharing power at the national level. there is a strong sense of nationalism, or what is called a **federal unifier.**

2014 to now: Resurgence of One-party System?

- Two general elections 2014 and 2019, saw a single party (BJP) on its own getting the full majority, **breaking the 25 years of compulsions of coalition politics.**

- However the Government is still formed out of alliance of many political parties.

- But the outlook of regional parties, now appears to be changing from **conflictual orientation to a tendency of co-operative bargaining** in respect of Centre-state relations.

Now the **financial problems** in the Centre-State relations are the main focus of attention.

- Today, the regional parties have provided **a new dimension to the process of national integration and nation building**

The regional parties have made a strong impact on the nature of Centre-State relations in India. They are a natural **consequence of a democratic system** based on adult franchise in multi-ethnic, multi-racial, multi-religious and multi-linguistic societies like India. **Thus, their growth is in synergy with entire spirit of democracy**

4.5 THE DECLINE AND FALL OF REGIONAL PARTIES

Hyderabad: As the National Democratic Alliance (NDA) was about to take office, it was reported that the Janata Dal (United), [JD(U)], a long-standing ally of the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) declined to join the government despite the alliance sweeping its home state, Bihar. The JD(U) probably read the tea leaves well and quickly realized two things. One, it was unlikely to have its way and second, it would not be prudent to antagonize the coalition-maker. This JD(U) story, in many ways, is the story of regional or state-based parties. From the margins to the centre and now back to the receiving end, the wheel has turned a full circle for the so-called regional parties.

If the JD(U) should feel sidelined almost immediately after an emphatic triumph, what does the future hold for other members of the regional party family under the hegemony of India's new predominant party, the BJP? The BJP's stated goal of a "Congress Mukt Bharat" is work in progress and the results are there for all to see. This goal as Suhas Palshikar, one of contemporary India's sharpest political observers, has persistently underlined is not merely one of increasing its electoral

dominance, but is, more importantly, a battle of ideas. The BJP's end goal is to discredit the Congress' secular-pluralist nationalist project and bring its majoritarian nationalist project to the centre.

To take the project to fruition, it follows that the regional and single-state parties are logically the next target. Though the 2019 results show that regional parties appear to have held their ground (particularly in southern states), the numbers hide more than they reveal. It does not tell us about their shrinking space, voice, and influence, but more importantly, also hides the immense pressure these parties are under to remain relevant. What then are the implications of the ascendance and dominance of the BJP for regional parties, federalism in particular, and Indian politics in general?

The Coalition-Era

Looking back, it now appears that the period between 1996 and 2014 was the high watermark for state-based parties. At the height of their influence, they even led two federal governments. Though limited to specific territories, they were federally competitive since the polity-wide parties were constrained by their geographic weaknesses and social deficits. Consequently, many regional parties who were once alienated moved to the centre (Tamil Nadu, for example) and were critical to both the formation and survival of all national-level governments. In this period, state-based parties held key ministerial portfolios in federal coalition governments, and had a greater say in national level decision making. From a position where they called the shots, today, it appears they are back to almost where they began.

Empirical evidence suggests that the power and influence of regional parties are inversely proportional to the strength of the polity-wide parties. Between 1996 and 2014, neither the BJP nor the Congress was in a position to form a government on their own and this put state-based parties in the driver's seat. However, we should not ignore the fact that it is the single-state parties who have the highest stakes in the coalitional system. The polity-wide parties prefer to govern alone and are in the coalitional game only because of the deficits mentioned above. Polity-wide parties will, therefore, constantly attempt to reduce their dependence on state-based parties by pushing to cover more territory as well as increase their social outreach. For single-state parties who want

to have a say at the centre—given the limited seats they contest—coalitions are the only game in town. Consequently, state-based parties across the board are united to keep polity-wide parties tied down and dependent on them to ensure power-sharing.

Towards the latter half of 2018, a set of regional political parties from different parts of the country attempted to recreate the magic that would push them to the centre-stage and recover the space ceded to the BJP. Five leaders, K. Chandrashekar Rao (Telangana Rashtra Samithi) from Telangana, Chandrababu Naidu (Telugu Desam Party) from Andhra Pradesh, Mamata Banerjee (All India Trinamool Congress) from West Bengal and both Mayawati (Bahujan Samaj Party) and Akhilesh Yadav (Samajwadi Party) from Uttar Pradesh were at the forefront of these efforts. At times, they appeared to work together. At times, separately. And sometimes, even against each other to both, push the cause of state-based parties as well as to position themselves as key players at the centre in the event of the polity-wide parties falling short of a majority.

With a potential 17 LokSabha seats, Rao was the most ambitious of them all and also first off the blocks. He has been in politics long enough to know how the winds blow and called for early assembly elections in 2018 instead of waiting for May 2019. When state and national elections are held together, comparative studies show that it is the national stage that sets the agenda and the focus will be on the central government and its leadership. Consequently, state units of polity-wide parties have an edge during simultaneous elections as they could leverage their central government potential. With the advantage of hindsight, it now appears that it was a smart political manoeuvre and Rao cut his losses since the BJP won four seats to the Lok Sabha. The separation of the elections ensured that the focus was on state-level issues, his party, and his leadership. The TRS decimated the opposition in the assembly elections, and this further vetted Rao's ambitions. Immediately after the elections, Rao travelled to states ruled by state-based parties championing the cause of a federal front that would be autonomous of both the BJP and the Congress. He also made the right noises on centre-state relations to strike a chord within the regional party, family calling for greater decentralization and doing away with the concurrent list.

Similarly, Chandrababu Naidu hit the ground running once the TDP checked out of the NDA. As in the mid-90s, he sought to become the pivot around which the regional and opposition parties could unite. To achieve this unity and give the proposed grouping additional leverage, the TDP did the unthinkable. It made peace with the Congress and joined hands with the latter for the Telangana elections. Naidu, like Rao, travelled to the same set of states pushing for a united opposition against the BJP. Naidu's rainbow coalition included parties opposed to each other but were united against the BJP.

While all this was happening, the BSP and the SP decided to come together in Uttar Pradesh, putting aside two decades of personal bitterness and confrontation. The mahagathbandan, as it was called, included Ajit Singh's Rashtriya Lok Dal. The alliance assumed that caste arithmetic and vote-pooling would bring them better results than 2014.

Meanwhile, on the eastern front, Mamata Banerjee happened to be the go-to player for all the leaders who aspired for a dominant role at the centre. She had the reputation of a fighter who worked under tremendous pressure and it was not surprising that they looked to her to deliver. She enhanced her reputation among the state-based parties by bringing together more than 20 parties opposed to the BJP under what was called the "United India" rally in Kolkata. With 42 seats in the Lok Sabha, West Bengal was a critical state in the calculations of the state-based parties, especially since the BJP was traditionally a weak player in the state.

Rude shock of results

The 2019 results must have shocked the regional parties and extinguished any dream of their leaders being influential actors at the centre. The BJP juggernaut rolled over everything that came in front of it. From the mid-1990s till about five years ago, state politics exhibited an autonomy of its own and national elections prominently reflected state-level differences. Voters responded to and prioritized state-level issues, and consequently, national elections displayed a greater variation and heterogeneity across states. This is reflected in the increased numbers of political parties being represented in the Lok Sabha.

Comparing the era of Congress dominance and the coalition-era, Yogendra Yadav and Suhas Palshikar pithily stated that, earlier, people voted in state elections as if they were choosing a prime minister. Now,

people voted in national elections (since the mid-1990s) as if they are choosing a chief minister. The 2014 and 2019 polls seem to have reversed this trend and brought wave elections back.

While Modi's leadership was a key factor in the success of the party, one cannot ignore how the BJP appears to have overcome the challenge posed by regional parties. The regional party family consists of two types of parties: the first type is regionally-located, and the others are the regionalist parties. The regionally-located parties do not necessarily have any regional or state-specific agenda. They are regional only because they compete and win only in limited territories. These include parties like the BSP, SP, Rashtriya Janata Dal, JD(U), among others.

Regionalist parties, however, have a clear and identifiable programmatic vision or plan for the territories they contest. Regionalist parties usually make a mix of three claims: One, the so-called national parties are incapable of addressing the specific concerns of the state; two, state honour, pride, culture and language among other issues should be protected; and three, the centre should cede more powers to the states. The TDP, Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam, All India Anna Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam, Shiv Sena, Shiromani Akali Dal and the National Conference are among the prominent regionalist parties.

The regionally-located parties represent both the success and failure of the great democratic upsurge of backward and lower castes in north India since the late 1980s. Competition soon led to the break-up of the big overarching groups into smaller single-caste groups. The BJP has been successful in exploiting the fault lines of this upsurge and attracting the support of groups that feel marginalized.

In one of the earliest studies on the BJP's expansion, Oliver Heath in the Economic and Political Weekly noted that the BJP redefines and appeals to different sections of society as it moves to new territories. This has allowed the party to expand its social base beyond the traditional upper-class. In both Uttar Pradesh and Bihar, the party opened itself or had alliances with non-dominant lower-caste groups that had begun to feel left out. This 'social engineering strategy' combined with its organizational reach short-circuited the plans of caste-based regionally-located parties in the so-called Hindi heartland.

The speed at which the UP mahagath bandan unravelled after the polls underlines two points. One, crafting an alliance is the easier half of the story; working, maintaining, and living the true-spirit of the coming-together is the more difficult part. Second, Lokniti National Election Studies surveys have consistently pointed to the fact that both the SP and the BSP have become one-caste dominated parties with the non-Yadav OBCs and the non- Dalit castes looking towards the BJP.

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

7.   Write a note on decline and fall of regional parties.

_____

_____

4.6 LET US SUM UP

A party has to fulfil any of the following conditions for recognition as a state party:

A party should win minimum three percent of the total number of seats or a minimum of three seats in the Legislative Assembly.

A party should win at least one seat in the Lok Sabha for every 25 seats or any fraction there of allotted to that State.

A party should secure at least six percent of the total valid votes polled during general election to a Lok Sabha or State Legislative Assembly and should, in addition, win at least one Lok Sabha, and two Legislative Assembly seats in that election,

Under the liberalized criteria, one more clause that it will be eligible for recognition as state party if it secures 8% or more of the total valid votes polled in the state, addition to one seat in any state.

Regional parties are parties whose main holds are in one certain state and mostly they participate in the elections only within that state. Most of

these regional parties have agenda fitting certain culture dominant within that state. Some of these regional parties also participate in neighbouring states, which have constituencies with culture similar to the first state. Different state parties were established at different periods because of different reasons. Some even have origins prior to India's independence.

In a democracy, political parties provide an agency to the society to gather different views on various issues and to present these to the government. They bring various representatives together so that a responsible government could be formed. They provide a mechanism to support or restrain the government, make policies, justify or oppose them. India has a multi-party system.

Modi's leadership was a key factor in the success of the party, one cannot ignore how the BJP appears to have overcome the challenge posed by regional parties. The regional party family consists of two types of parties: the first type is regionally-located, and the others are the regionalist parties. The regionally-located parties do not necessarily have any regional or state-specific agenda. They are regional only because they compete and win only in limited territories. These include parties like the BSP, SP, Rashtriya Janata Dal, JD(U), among others.

4.7 KEYWORDS

- ➤ Concept: A party should win minimum three percent of the total number of seats or a minimum of three seats in the Legislative Assembly.
- ➤ List of all state party: As of April 2019 the number of national parties in India are 7, the number of state recognised parties are 35 and Regional Parties in India are around 329.
- ➤ Rise of regional parties: In a democracy, political parties provide an agency to the society to gather different views on various issues and to present these to the government. They bring various representatives together so that a responsible government could be formed.

➢ Decline and fall: Looking back, it now appears that the period between 1996 and 2014 was the high watermark for state-based parties.

4.8 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. Discuss the concept of state parties.

2. Name 20 state parties in India with abbreviation.

3. Discuss the concept of regional parties.

4. Give some examples of state parties in India.

5. Discuss the growth of regional parties

6. Discuss the evolution of regional party.

7. Write a note on decline and fall of regional parties.

4.9 SUGGESTED READINGS AND REFERENCES

1. Politics in India (Second Edition) : Rajni Kothari, Orient Blackswan

2. M.M Punchhi Commission Report on Centre – State Relations, Volume VII- "Socio-economic development, Public policy and good governance"

3. Political Encyclopedia of U.S. States and Regions

4. The Oxford Handbook of State and Local Government Finance by Robert D. Ebel (Editor); John E. Petersen (Editor)

5. Guide to State Politics and Policy by Richard G. Niemi (Editor); Joshua J. Dyck
   ISBN: 9781452219967

4.10 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. A party has to live up to at least one of the following qualifications to be acknowledged as a state party.

A party has to fulfil any of the following conditions for recognition as a state party: A party should win minimum three percent of the total number of seats or a minimum of three seats in the Legislative Assembly.

A party should win at least one seat in the Lok Sabha for every 25 seats or any fraction thereof allotted to that State.

A party should secure at least six percent of the total valid votes polled during general election to a Lok Sabha or State Legislative Assembly and should, in addition, win at least one Lok Sabha, and two Legislative Assembly seats in that election,

Under the liberalized criteria, one more clause that it will be eligible for recognition as state party if it secures 8% or more of the total valid votes polled in the state, addition to one seat in any state.

2.

Name of state Party	State	Abbreviation
1. AamAadmi Party	Delhi	AAP
2. Arunachal Congress	Arunachal Pradesh	AC
3. All India Anna Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam	Tamil Nadu	AIADMK
4. Asom Gana Parishad	Assam	AGP
5. All India Forward Bloc	West Bengal	AIFB
6. Assam United Democratic Front	Assam	AUDF
7. BijuJanata Dal	Odisha	BJD
8. Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam	Tamil Nadu and Puducherry	DMK
9. Indian National Lok	Haryana	INLD

Dal		
10. Janata Dal (Secular)	Karnataka and Kerala	JD(S)
11. Janata Dal (United)	Bihar and Jharkhand	JD(U)
12. Jammu and Kashmir National Conference	Jammu & Kashmir	JKN
13. Jammu & Kashmir National Panthers Party	Jammu and Kashmir	JKNPP
14. Jammu & Kashmir Peoples Democratic Party	Jammu and Kashmir	JKPDP
15. Jharkhand MuktiMorcha	Jharkhand	JMM
16. Kerala Congress	Kerala	KEC
17. Kerala Congress (M)	Kerala	KEC(M)
18. Lok Jan Shakti Party	Bihar	LJP
19. Maharashtrawadi Gomantak	Goa	MAG
20. Marumalarchi Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam	Tamil Nadu and Puducherry	MDMK

3. It wouldn't be an overstatement to say that politics in India is dictated by regional parties. These smaller parties hold considerable clout in individual states, leading to a highly fragmented vote distribution. As a result, political alliances and surprise moves are a common spectacle, as governments are formed and dissolved unanticipated. The sentiment was echoed by West Bengal Chief Minister Mamata Banerjee before the 2014 elections, who said that the mainstream parties were "zero", and that the

future of India would be decided by regional political parties. Looking at the political history of India, there can be no doubt that regional parties are indeed the trump card. Below you will find the list of all regional political parties of India.

Regional parties are parties whose main holds are in one certain state and mostly they participate in the elections only within that state. Most of these regional parties have agenda fitting certain culture dominant within that state.

4. In Tamil Nadu in south India, two main state parties are All India Anna Dravida Munnetra Kazagham (AIADMK) and Dravida Munnetra Kazagham (DMK). Of these two parties the DMK is the veteran party. The origins of these parties are prior to India's independence. The main ideology of this party is Tamil national pride. Before India's independence there were two Dravidian Parties. Other was Justice Party, which had a Dravidian pride ideology. After India's Independence, the Dravida Munnetra Kazagham (DMK) was established from the merger of these two parties in the former state of Madras, in South India.

Another one state party is Akali Dal and its main hold is in Punjab, North India. This party is considered a state party, but actually it is a religion oriented party whose followers are the Sikhs. This party also has its origin prior to India's independence. Before Independence this party demanded from the British a separate entity for the Sikhs in Punjab. During the independence period these demands were delayed for a while. After independence this party began demanding special status for the Sikh culture and the Punjabi language.

5. Regional parties started growing all over the country.

▪ The dismal performance of the Congress led to a series of power struggles with in congress.

▪ Ultimately, the party was split in 1969 and Indira Gandhi's supremacy was established both in the party and the government.

▪ However, some leaders like Morarji Desai in Gujarat and JP (Jaiprakash Narain) in Bihar carried out a **successful movement against Congress** corruption and arbitrary rule.

- Their movement peaked in 1975 when **Indira Gandhi for the first and only time in Indian history decided to impose in Internal emergency**

6. Evolution of Regional Party

- Over the last four decades, the number and strength of regional parties has expanded.

- This has made the Parliament of India **politically more diverse.** Regional political parties have emerged to **fulfil regional aspirations.**

- No one national party is able to secure on its own a majority in Lok Sabha. As a result, the national parties are compelled to form alliances with State parties. The regional political parties started playing a crucial role in coalition politics since 1989.

- It is because of the regional political parties that our **party-system has been federalized.** The Centre has begun to address their problems and respond their aspirations through accommodation.

- The evolving nature of our party system has **strengthened the cooperative trends of our federal system.**

7. The 2019 results must have shocked the regional parties and extinguished any dream of their leaders being influential actors at the centre. The BJP juggernaut rolled over everything that came in front of it. From the mid-1990s till about five years ago, state politics exhibited an autonomy of its own and national elections prominently reflected state-level differences. Voters responded to and prioritized state-level issues, and consequently, national elections displayed a greater variation and heterogeneity across states. This is reflected in the increased numbers of political parties being represented in the Lok Sabha.

UNIT -5: COALITION POLITICS; PARTY ALLIANCES AND GOVERNMENT FORMATION

STRUCTURE

5.0 OBJECTIVES

After studying this unit, you should be able to:

- Understand what is the meaning of coalition
- Coalition politics in the states
- Learn about party alliances
- Learn about government formation

5.1 INTRODUCTION

After the disappearance of Muslim League from the political scene of India in 1947, Indian National Congress was the only national party which commanded popularity and respect of the people. This party undoubtedly had mass base and worked at the grassroots in India.

Therefore, the power was ultimately transferred to this party, when British left India. The party had in its fold galaxy of all national leaders of those days. It was liberal in its approach to every national problem and flexible enough to absorb very divergent views.

It remained in power both at the centre as well as in the states right from 1947 to 1967, when its hold weakened due to several reasons. Important among these being death of Nehruji , India's defeat at the hands of China and inflationary trends in Indian economy. Since Indian National Congress was the only important political party on Indian scene, therefore, it had monolithic character. It was in power both at the centre and m the slates.

5.2 MEANING OF COALITION

It was only after 1967 elections that coalition experiment in India started. But, before discussing this, it will be interesting to study, as to what is coalition system. Broadly speaking, coalition means uniting and coming together into one body for a particular purpose, which in other words means pooling of resources for achieving a particular purpose.It also means joint use of resources and an alliance for joint action of various groups or organisations into a single government of distinct parties. In the word of Ogg, **"Coalition, as employed in political sense, commonly denotes a co-operative arrangement under which distinct political parties, or at all events members of such parties unite to form a government or Ministry."**

Coalitions obviously come into existence to have some gains and rewards of both material and psychical nature and for this partners must be two or more. These come together under the force of certain circumstances. In every coalition joining partners are supposed to give up their rigid stand and follow the principle of give and take. More elasticity in approach, more lasting shall be the coalition.

The parties joining coalition agree to a minimum programme, but before reaching that there is always some bargaining by each partner to have

maximum advantage. That programme becomes goal for all political parties to achieve during their partnership period.

But it does not mean that once the parties form a coalition they completely merge their identity. All the parties continue to maintain their identity. As soon as any of the coalition partner finds it difficult to pull on well with other partner(s) that leaves the coalition. In the process another party which higher to was not a coalition partner might join that and thus lend support to the coalition.

It is also just possible that some political party or parties might face break up due to internal feuds and one of the breakaway groups might decide to join the coalition as partner and the other might keep off from it.

When all the parties which agree to work together for implementing a particular common programme, but do not merge themselves to form a new party, is called a coalition. But as soon as they decide to merge themselves to form a new party then that no longer remains a coalition.

This is what happened when Janata party was formed and again the same can be said about the formation of Lok Dal. In some cases a political party may not like to join the coalition but may support it from outside. In 1979, a section of Congress party extended its support to Choudhury Charan Singh government from outside. Similarly government of V.P. Singh in 1989 was extended support by B.J.P. from outside.

In 1995, B.J.P. extended support from outside to Ms Mayawati government in U.P. In that case it can be called as indirect coalition partner. It is, however, left to every political party to withdraw such a support at any time. Thus, coalition system is a continuing process in which political parties come and go and new ones join and also withdraw and so on.

A coalition can have members belonging to any profession or field of activity. Needless to say that in political field the parties and organisations, join efforts to share power and have the best possible

advantages and make every effort to win political arena in the face of all odds.

Each party goes to the farthest end to avoid defeat and for the purpose it uses all means and methods. The main aim of coalition is to capture power immediately or in the near future.

A coalition can work both in a tactic or formal form. In the former sense it means the role of single party in power but working with the indirect support of other political parties, whereas in the latter case parties which decide to come together join openly and share power.

This is what happened in 1979, when Charan Singh formed care-taker government. Congress (I) then with Y.B. Chavan as leader of the parliamentary party in the LokSabha and AIADMK joined the coalition government, but Congress (I) with C.M. Stephen as leader of the party in the Lok Sabha, decided to give its support to the government from outside, but decided not to join the government headed by Charan Singh.

In 1989, when National Front formed government both BJP and leftist parties decided to extend support from outside and did not join the government. Coalition can also be formed for constructive as well as destructive purposes.

When a coalition is formed with the object of pulling down political party in power and also that of providing an alternative government, it can be called positive coalition.

But when parties join and come together, just with the object of pulling down the government already in power and not taking the burden of forming a new government, or providing no other better alternative, then such a coalition can be called negative coalition.

The coalition partners perhaps never think in terms of permanent friendship. All of them realise that it is only a short term arrangement to achieve a particular end and nothing beyond that. In politics it means capturing political power from the opponent and retaining that for a maximum period.

It is all temporary arrangement and a compromise with selfish motives. In it the conflicts do not end but are just kept aside for the time being but these come to surface as soon as there are tension among coalition partners.

5.3 COALITION POLITICS IN THE STATES

As long as monolithic character of the party continued and Congress party remained in power, both at the centre as well as in the states, there was no question of any coalition government. But experiment in coalitions started really after the 1967 elections, when Congress lost heavily in some of the states and opposition parties came to power.

It was after this year that in several Indian states 'Aya Ram and Gaya Ram' process started. Party position in each state as on 1.4.1968 was as shown on pages 149-150.

From the foregoing it will be seen that Congress party was in majority in Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Gujarat, Haryana, J and K, Mysore, Maharashtra and M.P., whereas it was in minority in Bihar, Kerala, Orissa, Punjab, Rajasthan, U.P. and West Bengal.

It is an interesting study to be undertaken as to how each of the stale where Congress could not form a government and Non-Congress parties formed a government functioned and under what circumstances did these break out.

Kerala:

In Kerala, a United Front coalition consisting of CPM, CPI, SSP, RSP, KTP and KPS formed government on 5th March, 1967, with E.M.S. Namboodripad, as Chief Minister. But soon the coalition came under strains because coalition partners charged the Chief Minister of protecting his own party people.

There was also no improvement in food, as well as law and order situation. CPM also organised Gopal Sena which murdered those who worked for the landlords and began searches of food grains hoarders, etc.

In turn Congress and Kerala Congress founded Citizen's Council. In November, 1967 activities of CPM workers became more violent in some areas of the state under the leadership of Narayana and his daughter Ajitha.

Some of the constituents units demanded that judicial enquiries should be held against the Marxists, who were attacking even police stations. The constituents of UF government also began to charge each other of corruption and bribery.

The Chief Minister ordered an enquiry into corruption charges against CPI and ISP Ministers but refused to order enquiry against Marxist Ministers, five MLAs of die parties against whom enquiries were ordered resigned on 17th October, 1969.

On October 24, 1967 House passed a resolution by which it resolved that corruption charges against all other Ministers should also be investigated. As a protest the Chief Minister resigned.

On November 1, 1966, a new coalition Ministry headed by C. Achuta Menon (CPI) was formed with the support of Congress. The coalition partners now were CPI, ISP, RSP and Kerala Congress. This was intolerable for CPM, and the party started violent activities in the state. The workers began to forcibly capture private land and adopted obstructionist activities inside the Assembly.

They did not allow the Governor to read his Address. It was also propagated that the new government was not interested in implementing land reform policies. But the government survived all these shocks and it became clear that it enjoyed comfortable majority, when a vote of thanks to the Governor, for his Address to the House was passed by 73 to 55 votes.

This still more baffled the CPM and the party followed obstructionist policies in the Assembly. They did not allow the government to function and the House was dissolved on 26th June, 1970 and the state was put

under President's rule on 4th August, 1970. Thus, ended first experiment of coalition governments in the state.

In September 1970 elections were again held in the state. This time one Front was dominated by CPM, the other by CPI, and still other by Congress (O). CPM front had its allies SSP, KSP and KIP, whereas CPI had among its supporters RSP, PSP and Muslim League. Congress (O) had its allies in Kerala Congress, Jan Sangh, Swatantra Party, DMK and ISP.

As a result of elections Congress party won 32, CPM 26, SSP 6, KIP 2, KSP 2, CPI 16, Muslim League 11, RSP 6, PSP 3, Kerala Congress 12, ISP 3 and independents 12. CPM was definite loser as its strength in the Assembly which was 52 in 1967 came down to 37 in 1970, whereas that of Kerala Congress improved and its strength increased from 5 to 13. Congress party emerged as the single largest party in the Assembly.

In the new Assembly one important reason for the downfall of the CPM was popularity of Prime Minister Smt. Indira Gandhi and her appeal to young voters to vote for her party. In October 1970, Achuta Menon formed coalition government with the support of the Congress from outside. Normal term of the Assembly was to expire in July 1975, but that was extended by another 6 months.

In 1977, elections were held for the state assembly and Kerala again carried on coalition experiment.

This time the Ministry was headed by K .Karuna karan but it survived only for 3 months. In April 1977 he was succeeded by A. K. Anthony as State Chief Minister. In 1980 elections CPM captured two-thirds majority in the Assembly and a new Ministry headed by E. K. Nayanar was formed in January of that year.

The Ministry remained in office for about 2 years which was made to resign. New government was headed by K. Karunakaran but there were internal conflicts and it resigned. Due to political instability in the State President's rule was imposed.

In May 1982 elections for the state Assembly were again held and this time United Democratic Front headed by Congress (I) was returned to power. It captured 77 seats as against 63 captured by Left Democratic Front led by CPM. Accordingly a United Democratic Front formed government with K. Karunakaran as its Chief Minister.

In 1987 elections were again held for State Assembly. Left Democratic Front led by CPI won 76 seats in the House of 138 and thus threw United Democratic Front out of power.

Election for the Kerala Assembly were again held in 1991 in which Congress(I) led United Democratic Front captured majority of the seats in a House of 140 whereas Left Democratic Front got the second position. UDF formed the government under the leadership of K. Karunakaran.

But after some time some parties in the government demanded change in state leadership and threatened that in case their demand was not accepted they would leave the front. Accordingly in Mid 1995 K. Karunakaran resigned as State Chief Minister and was replaced by A.K. Anthony. The former joined the Central government as Cabinet Minister.

Thus the state had to work under coalition system, as in the past. Whereas before these elections U.D.F. was in majority, now L.D.F has come to power.

In the state there is hold of the leftist parties, who among themselves form Fronts and join together. Janata Party which swept the polls in North India, did not fair well in the state. Congress (I) is playing a significant role in state politics. The state so far has not attained political stability.

Uttar Pradesh:

U.P. is one of such states, which was traditionally considered a strong hold of the Congress party. It was this state which so far has given several Prime Ministers to the country. In the central cabinet U.P. always

got and continues to get very good representation and moulds national politics.

In 1967 elections out of 425 seats of Legislative Assembly Congress party got only 195 seats and no political party got absolute majority, and coalition governments had to be formed.

The opposition parties joined together to form United Front Government and elected Ram Chandra Vikal as their leader. But an old Congress stalwart C.B. Gupta could form government in the state. But on the allocation of portfolios, Chief Minister developed differences with Charan Singh, another prominent state leader.

There were elections and C.B. Gupta government suffered a defeat on 1st April, on the motion of vote of thanks to the Governor for his address. Chief Minister then resigned. United Front now elected Charan Singh as its leader, who took over as State Chief Minister on 3rd April, 1967.

But after few months differences in the SVD (Samyukta Vidhayah Dal) came on the surface. In June 1967 some Swatantra ML As and a Minister of that party resigned from the government. On October 6, the party declared withdrawal of support from the government. On October 15 of the same year seven SSP and CPI Ministers resigned on the issue of release of political prisoners arrested in connection with 1966 agitation.

On 5th January, 1968 three SSP Ministers decided to leave and Jan Sangh, a constituent of the government and party badly criticised the Chief Minister. Since criticism from all corners was mounting Charan Singh tendered his resignation to the Governor on 17th February 1968 and thus ended the experiment of coalition government.

On 25th February, 1968 state was placed under President rule and Assembly was kept in a state of suspension. It was dissolved on 15th April, 1968.

Fresh elections to the state Assembly were held on February 9, 1969 and this time Congress improved its position. It won 211 seats, as against 195 captured by it in 1967. BKD of Charan Singh captured 99 seats but Jan

Sangh suffered a set back when it captured 49 seats only as against 98 in 1967.

Similarly SSP which had 44 seats in 1967 had to satisfy itself with only 33 now. Swatantra party lost 7 seats and now had 5 only. As compared with 14 seats in 1967, now CPI had 4 and PSP 3 as compared with 11 in 1967. Republican party still more suffered. It had 9 seats in 1967, but got only 1 now and conditions of independents was in no way better, as against 37 seats in 1967 they now had 18 only.

Though Congress party had no absolute majority yet with the help of few independents party leader C.B. Gupta could form Congress government on 25th February, 1969. But in 1969 there was split in the party resulting in instability. Kamlapati Tripathi and his supporters who sided with the Prime Minister, decided not to support C.B. Gupta government, as the Chief Minister was with Congress .

They started negotiations with B.K.D. leader Charan Singh, for the formation of a coalition government. Meanwhile in order to save his position C.B. Gupta also started negotiations with Charan Singh. On 10th February, 1970 C.B. Gupta tendered his resignation as Chief Minister and suggested the Governor to invite Charan Singh to form government.

He assured his support and support of SSP and Jan Sangh to him. But soon after differences between BKD and other parties developed and Charan Singh decided to form government with co-operation of Congress. He was sworn-in as Chief Minister on February 17, 1970.

But it did not take long when differences between BKD and Congress (N) developed on taking over of private mills and abolition of compulsory membership of students unions on the one hand and merger of Congress and BKD on the other. These widened when BKD group in Parliament voted against abolition of Privy Purses.

Finding that Tripathi group might withdraw its support from the government Chief Minister negotiated with Congress (O), Jan Sangh and Swatantra parties.

On 24tli September Charan Singh asked for the resignation of the Congress Ministers and immediately Congress decided to withdraw its support from the government. Tripathi wrote to Governor that since Chief Minister was leader of only a minority in the Assembly, therefore, his advice about dissolution of Assembly may not be accepted. Congress (O), Jan Sangh, SSP and Swatantra parties immediately intimated the Governor that they had decided to extend their support to the Chief Minister. Since Governor was in a fix he called for the advice of Attorney General Niren De and State Advocate General K.L. Mishra.

The opinion of the two about the dismissal of Chief Minister differed and Governor acting on the advice of De recommended to the President to place State under President rule. A special courier was sent to Russia, on October 1, 1970, where President was away on tour and after getting his approval state was placed under President rule on October 2, 1970.

The action of the President was much criticised by opposition parties, both in the Parliament and outside.

Few days later, BKD, Jan Sangh, Swatantra and SSP formed SVD and elected T.N. Singh as their leader. Tripathi staked his claim to form the government but Singh was invited to form new government. He was sworn in as Chief Minister on October 17, 1970.

Since T. N. Singh was not a member of the Assembly he contested by-election on January 5, 1971 but was defeated and offered to resign. He was, however, asked to continue till March 1971, when Lok Sabha elections were due. As a result of these elections Congress won 73 out of 85 Lok Sabha seats.

This influenced state politics and many SVD members left the party and joined Congress reducing it to minority position, T. N. Singh government was defeated in the Assembly on 30th March, 1971. Tripathi took over as new Chief Minister of the state on 14th April, 1971.

Tripathi government, however, faced serious crisis in summer 1973 due to student agitation and in order to improve the image of the party Chief

Minister recommended the Governor to bring the state under President rule and this was done on 12th June, 1973. This action of the Governor was much criticised by opposition parties. President rule continued till 27th October.

The party by now felt that in order to be on an advantageous position it should again hold reign of office in the state and on 27th October Governor was requested to lift President rule from the state as situation had already much improved. On 6th November, 1973, H. N. Bahuguna was sworn in as U.P.'s new Chief Minister.

In 1977, Janata Party came to power at the centre and it decided that since Congress party had lost contacts with the people, therefore, fresh elections should be held in the state. As a result of these elections, Janata Party came to power with absolute majority in the State Assembly.

Since Janata Party was in absolute majority, therefore, there was no question of formation of a coalition government.

In 1980 Congress (I) came to power at the centre and decided that election to the state Assembly should be held afresh, as the Janata Party had lost contacts with the people. As a result of these elections Congress (I) was returned to power with absolute majority.

Therefore, there was no question of formation of coalition government with any other political party in the state and Congress formed the government by itself. In a House of 425, it had a strength of 306.

West Bengal:

Bengal also saw an interesting drama of coalition politics. Ajay Kumar Mukerjee, one time Congress Party President, left the party and formed a new party with the help of left wing parties. In the elections which were held in 1967, though Congress emerged as the single largest party with 127 seats in a House of 280, yet all its efforts to form the government were frustrated when all opposition parties combined together were against it.

These elected Ajay Kumar Mukerjee as their leader, who was sworn-in as state Chief Minister in February, 1967. But soon differences developed in the government over the implementation of party programme. But on November 2, Dr. P.C. Ghosh an independent Minister resigned from the government, and intimated the Governor that 17 other members had also withdrawn their support from the government.

Subsequently 15 of them confirmed this. Congress party which had by then 130 members also informed the Governor that it would extend its support to Ghosh government.

The Governor then asked Chief Minister to convene a session of the Assembly at a very early date, but when he found that the latter was in no mood to do so, he dismissed Mukerjee government on 21st November and invited P. C. Ghosh to form the government. As a protest against the decision of the Governor there were violent demonstrations in the state.

Assembly session was called on 29th November and when the House met Speaker Bijoy Kumar Bannerjee adjourned the House sine die declaring that dismissal of Mukerjee government was unconstitutional and thereafter there were violent demonstrations in the state.

On 15th January, 1968 some MLAs who were so far supporting the government from outside, joined the government and announced the formation of Indian National Democratic Front (INDF), UF group decided to extend its support to INDF and their leader staked his claim to form government.

On 14th February Assembly met for its budget session but UF MLAs blockaded the doors when Governor came to deliver his address. He was made to enter from the back door, but could not read his Address. There were all chaos and finding that it was impossible to run the government Dr. Sen resigned and state was placed under President rule on 20th February, 1968.

Election to the state Assembly were held on 9th February, 1969. But after elections in the Assembly party position was such that no party was in absolute majority and coalition experiment and politics had to be carried on.

In a House of 280, UF had voting strength of 156, but differences developed over the leadership of the party. Jyoti Basu staked his claim as leader of the party, being the leader of largest constituent unit. But this was not accepted by others. Ultimately after prolonged negotiations it was agreed that Ajay kumar Mukerjee shall be the Chief Minister, and Basu will join cabinet as Home Minister with police department.

On 25th February the new government came to power. But soon thereafter, CPM workers created law and order situation, looted properties of the people, instigated labourers to capture surplus land.

The situation became so worse that Chief Minister himself had to go on fast with thousand workers against high handedness of CPM workers. But Basu and Police Department did nothing to check the situation. The conditions so much worsened that at one point of time CPM students man-handled Chief Minister, but police present at that time did nothing to save the situation.

Finding that the situation was absolutely out of control, the Chief Minister tendered his resignation on 16th March and state was brought under President rule on 19th March, 1970. Finally, the Assembly was dissolved on 30th July and elections were held on March 10, 1971. Again no political party won absolute majority.

This again led to the problem of formation of government. After prolonged negotiations Congress decided to support Ajay kumar Mukerjee and on April 2, he formed his government. But after 2 months there were differences in Bangla Congress itself.

There would have been realignments but meantime Bangladesh crisis took place and Chief Minister recommended dissolution of the Assembly

and this was done on 25th June and President rule was imposed on 28th June of the same year.

In 1972, elections to the state Assembly were again held but now there was no need for the formation coalition government because this time Congress party was returned with absolute majority.

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.   Discuss the meaning of coalition.

_____

_____

_____

2.   Discuss the West Bengal coalition politics in the states.

_____

_____

_____

5.4 PARTY ALLIANCES

A **political alliance**, also known as a **coalition** or **bloc**, is cooperation by members of different political parties, in countries with a parliamentary system, on a common agenda of some kind. This usually involves formal agreements between two or more entire parties, and often takes place mainly for the purpose of contesting an election. An alliance is usually especially beneficial to the parties concerned during and immediately after elections – due to characteristics of the electoral systems concerned (e.g. allowing each party to clear election thresholds) and/or allowing parties to participate in formation of a government after elections. These may break up quickly, or hold together for decades becoming the de facto norm, operating almost as a single unit.

Coalition governments are formed when a political alliance comes to power, or when only a plurality (not a majority) has not been reached and

several parties must work together to govern. One of the peculiarities of such a method of governance results in minister without portfolio. There are several reasons as to why the Alliance government system is getting special significance at present.

1. Due to increase in the number of political parties.

2. Due to decrease in the significance of a single political parties.

3. After spending so many thousands of cores of public money in holding an election if no stable government can be formed due to the complexities that arise for not getting the absolute majority by any of the parties taking a part in the election, in such a circumstances forming of the alliance or coalition government is the only alternative left to avoid spending of public money again by holding another election.

5.4.1. Seven Party Alliances

The Seven Party Alliance was a coalition of seven Nepali political parties seeking to end autocratic rule in the country. They spearheaded the Loktantra Andolan.

The alliance was made up of the following parties:

- Nepali Congress
- Nepali Congress (Democratic)
- Communist Party of Nepal (Unified Marxist-Leninist) (Withdrew from government, Sunday May 3, 2009) [1]
- Nepal Workers and Peasants Party
- Nepal Goodwill Party (Anandi Devi)
- United Left Front
- People's Front

These seven parties made up 194 of the 205 seats allocated in the 1999 Nepalese legislative elections, the only significant exception being the Monarchist Rashtriya Prajatantra Party. The RPP split into three factions, with one faction openly supporting the royal take-over and the two others maintaining criticism towards it.

The name "Seven Party Alliance" has always been a misnomer, since one of its members (ULF) is an alliance in itself, consisting of three parties.

Moreover, the two largest members, Congress and the CPN(UML) are each much larger than the rest of the members put together.

5.5 GOVERNMENT FORMATION

Government formation is the process in a parliamentary system of selecting a prime minister and cabinet members. If no party controls a majority of seats, it can also involve deciding which parties will be part of a coalition government. It usually occurs after an election, but can also occur after a vote of no confidence in an existing government.

5.5.1 Delays or failures in forming a government

A failure to form a government is a type of cabinet crisis where a coalition controlling a majority of seats cannot be agreed upon.

The process of government formation can sometimes be lengthy. For example, following the 2013 German federal election, Germany engaged in 85 days of government formation negotiations, the longest in the nation's post-war history. The outcome was the third Merkel cabinet, another grand coalition led by Angela Merkel.

Belgium

Belgian governments are typically coalition governments due to the split between the Flemish and French parts of the country. On occasion, this has led to a situation where no party is able to form a government but the Parliament does not vote to return to the polls. This occurred most notably in 2010–11, when Belgium operated without a government for 541 days. Though there were calls for drastic measures to resolve the issue, including via a partition of Belgium, government services were not disrupted due to the implementation of a caretaker government and the devolution of most key functions.

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

3.   Discuss why the Alliance government system is getting special significance at present._____

4.   Discuss the meaning of government formation.

5.6 LET US SUM UP

It was only after 1967 elections that coalition experiment in India started. But, before discussing this, it will be interesting to study, as to what is coalition system. Broadly speaking, coalition means uniting and coming together into one body for a particular purpose, which in other words means pooling of resources for achieving a particular purpose.It also means joint use of resources and an alliance for joint action of various groups or organisations into a single government of distinct parties. In the word of Ogg, **"Coalition, as employed in political sense, commonly denotes a co-operative arrangement under which distinct political parties, or at all events members of such parties unite to form a government or Ministry."** As long as monolithic character of the party continued and Congress party remained in power, both at the centre as well as in the states, there was no question of any coalition government. But experiment in coalitions started really after the 1967 elections, when Congress lost heavily in some of the states and opposition parties came to power. A **political alliance**, also known as a **coalition** or **bloc**, is cooperation by members of different political parties, in countries with a parliamentary system, on a common agenda of some kind. This usually involves formal agreements between two or more entire parties, and often takes place mainly for the purpose of contesting an election. **Government formation** is the process in a parliamentary system of selecting a prime minister and cabinet members. If no party controls a majority of seats, it can also involve deciding which parties will be part of a coalition

government. It usually happens after an election, but can also occur after a vote of no confidence in an existing government.

5.7 KEYWORDS

- ➤ Coalition politics: As long as monolithic character of the party continued and Congress party remained in power, both at the centre as well as in the states, there was no question of any coalition government.

- ➤ Party alliances: A **political alliance**, also known as a **coalition** or **bloc**, is cooperation by members of different political parties, in countries with a parliamentary system, on a common agenda of some kind.

- ➤ Government formation: **Government formation** is the process in a parliamentary system of selecting a prime minister and cabinet members.

5.8 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. Discuss the meaning of coalition.

2. Discuss the West Bengal coalition politics in the states.

3. Discuss why the Alliance government system is getting special significance at present.

4. Discuss the meaning of government formation.

5.9 SUGGESTED READINGS AND REFERENCES

1."Tories and Lib Dems enter full coalition government". The New Statesman.

*2.*Jungjohann, Arne (2017). German Greens in Coalition Governments. A Political Analysis (PDF).Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung European Union and Green European Foundation.p. 19.

3. "Coalition Government: Precedents from around the world". CBC News. 2010-05-13. Retrieved 2009-05-14.

4.Menon, Nirmala (2008-12-02). "Coalition Set To Topple Canada PM". Wall Street Journal. Retrieved 2008-12-02.

5.Kuldip Singh (1995-04-11). "OBITUARY: Morarji Desai". The Independent Retrieved 2009-06-27.

5.10 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. It was only after 1967 elections that coalition experiment in India started. But, before discussing this, it will be interesting to study, as to what is coalition system. Broadly speaking, coalition means uniting and coming together into one body for a particular purpose, which in other words means pooling of resources for achieving a particular purpose. It also means joint use of resources and an alliance for joint action of various groups or organisations into a single government of distinct parties. In the word of Ogg, **"Coalition, as employed in political sense, commonly denotes a co-operative arrangement under which distinct political parties, or at all events members of such parties unite to form a government or Ministry."** Coalitions obviously come into existence to have some gains and rewards of both material and psychical nature and for this partners must be two or more. These come together under the force of certain circumstances and part of the company as soon as those circumstances cease to exist.

2. Bengal also saw an interesting drama of coalition politics. Ajay Kumar Mukerjee, one time Congress Party President, left the party and formed a new party with the help of left wing parties. In the elections which were held in 1967, though Congress emerged as the single largest party with 127 seats in a House of 280, yet all its efforts to form the government were frustrated when all opposition parties combined together were against it. These elected Ajay Kumar Mukerjee as their leader, who was sworn-in as state Chief Minister in February, 1967. But soon differences

developed in the government over the implementation of party programme. But on November 2, Dr. P.C. Ghosh an independent Minister resigned from the government, and intimated the Governor that 17 other members had also withdrawn their support from the government.

3. Alliance government system is getting special significance at present.

Due to increase in the number of political parties.

Due to decrease in the significance of a single political parties.

After spending so many thousands of cores of public money in holding an election if no stable government can be formed due to the complexities that arise for not getting the absolute majority by any of the parties taking a part in the election, in such a circumstances forming of the alliance or coalition government is the only alternative left to avoid spending of public money again by holding another election.

4.Government formation is the process in a parliamentary system of selecting a prime minister and cabinet members. If no party controls a majority of seats, it can also involve deciding which parties will be part of a coalition government. It usually occurs after an election, but can also occur after a vote of no confidence in an existing government.

UNIT - 6: FEDERALISM, REGIONALISM, POITICAL PARTIES

STRUCTURE

6.0 OBJECTIVES

After studying this unit, you should be able to:

- Understand the concept of federalism, regionalism
- Learn about the advantages and disadvantages of federalism
- Understand of the effects of regionalism in Indian politics
- Learn about political parties in India

6.1 INTRODUCTION

If you have studied our constitution carefully, you will see it calls India a "Union of States". This statement is what gives our country a federal

structure. Let us learn more about federalism and why we call India a quasi-federal country.

To understand regionalism, we need to know various dimensions of the region. Region as a geographical unit, is delimited form each other. Region as a social system, reflects the relation between different human beings and groups. Regions are an organised cooperation in cultural, economic, political or military fields. Region acts as a subject with distinct identity, language, culture and tradition.

Regionalism is an ideology and political movement that seeks to advance the causes of regions. As a process it plays role within the nation as well as outside the nation i.e. at international level. Both types of regionalism have different meaning and have positive as well as negative impact on society, polity, diplomacy, economy, security, culture, development, negotiations, etc.

At the international level, regionalism refers to

transnational cooperation to meet a common goal or to resolve a shared problem or it refers to a group of countries such as-Western Europe, or Southeast Asia, linked by geography, history or economic features. Used in this sense, regionalism refers to attempts to reinforce the links between these countries economic features.

6.2 CONCEPT OF FEDERALISM

Federalism is compound mode of two governments. That is, in one system there will be a mixture of two governments – state government with central government. In India, we can describe federalism as a distribution of authority around local, national, and state governments. This is similar to Canadian model of political organization.

Federalism is at its core a system where the dual machinery of government functions. Generally, under federalism, there are two levels of government. One is a central authority which looks after the major affairs of the country. The other is more of a local government which looks after the day to day functioning and activities of their particular region.

For example, our Indian Constitution says that India too is a federal country. As you know we have two levels of parliament, the at center the

Union government and at State level, we have the individual State governments.

Federalism is the mixed or compound mode of government, combining a general government (the central or "federal" government) with regional governments (provincial, state, cantonal, territorial or other sub-unit governments) in a single political system. Its distinctive feature, exemplified in the founding example of modern federalism by the United States under the Constitution of 1787, is a relationship of parity between the two levels of government established. Federalism can thus be defined as a form of government in which there is a division of powers, between two levels of government of equal status.

Federalism differs from confederalism, in which the general level of government is subordinate to the regional level, and from devolution within a unitary state, in which the regional level of government is subordinate to the general level. It represents the central form in the pathway of regional integration or separation, bounded on the less integrated side by confederalism and on the more integrated side by devolution within a unitary state.

An early historical example of Federalism is the Achaean League in Hellenistic Greece. Unlike the Greek city states of Classical Greece, each of which insisted on keeping its complete independence, changing conditions in the Hellenistic period drove many city states to band together even at the cost of losing part of their sovereignty - similar to the process leading to the formation of later federations.

Leading examples of the federation or federal state include the United States, India, Brazil, Mexico, Russia, Germany, Canada, Switzerland, Arge ntina, and Australia. Some also today characterize the European Union as the pioneering example of federalism in a multi-state setting, in a concept termed the federal union of states.

The Government of India (referred to as the *Union Government*) was established by the Constitution of India, and is the governing authority of a *federal union* of 28 states and 9 union territories.

The government of India is based on a 3 tiered system, in which the Constitution of India delineates the subjects on which each tier of government has executive powers. The Constitution originally provided for a two-tier system of government, the Union Government (also known as the Central Government), representing the Union of India, and the State governments. Later, a third tier was added in the form of Panchayats and Municipalities. In the current arrangement, The Seventh Schedule of the Indian Constitution delimits the subjects of each level of governmental jurisdiction, dividing them into three lists:

- Union List includes subjects of national importance such as defence of the country, foreign affairs, banking, communications and currency. The Union Government alone can make laws relating to the subjects mentioned in the Union List.

- State List contains subjects of State and local importance such as police, trade, commerce, agriculture and irrigation. The State Governments alone can make laws relating to the subjects mentioned in the State List.

- Concurrent List includes subjects of common interest to both the Union Government as well as the State Governments, such as education, forest, trade unions, marriage, adoption and succession. Both the Union as well as the State Governments can make laws on the subjects mentioned in this list. If their laws conflict with each other, the law made by the Union Government will prevail.

6.3 FEATURES OF FEDERALISM

The best way to comprehensively understand the federal system is to learn about its features. These characteristics combined to reflect the true essence of federalism. Let us study them.

1. The essential feature, which is the definition of federalism is that there are two levels of governance in the country at least. There can even be more. But the entire power is not concentrated with one government.

2. All levels of governance will govern the same citizens, but their jurisdiction will be different. This means that each level of government will have a specific power to form laws, legislate and execute these laws. Both of the governments will have clearly marked jurisdiction. It will not be that one of the government is just a figurehead government.

3. Another important feature is that the constitution must guarantee this federal system of government. Which means the powers and duties of both or all governments must be listed down in the constitution of that country hence guaranteeing a federal system of governance.

4. As stated above the federalism of a country must be prescribed by the constitution. But it is also important that just one level of government cannot make unilateral changes or amendments to the important and essential provisions of the constitution. Such changes must be approved by all the levels of the government to be carried through.

5. Now there are two levels of government with separate jurisdictions and separate duties. Yet there is still a possibility that a conflict may arise between the two. Well in a federal state, it will fall upon the courts or rather the judiciary to resolve this conflict. The courts must have the power to interfere in such a situation and reach a resolution.

6. While there is power sharing between the two levels of government, there should also be a system in place for revenue sharing. Both levels of government should have their own autonomous revenue streams. Because if one such government depends on the other for funds to carry out its functions, it really is not autonomous in its true nature.

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. Discuss the concept of federalism.

_____

_____

_____

2. Discuss the features of federalism.

_____

_____

6.4 INDIA- A FEDERAL STATE

India is a federal country. But not once in the constitution is the word "federation" ever mentioned. Instead what is said is that India is a "Union of States'. Actually many historians believe that India is a quasi-federal country. It means it is a federal state with some features of a unitary government. Let us see the reasons.

The constitution of India has essentially prescribed a federal state of government. As you already know we have several levels of government, The Government at the center, which id the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha. Then the various state governments, the Vidhan Sabhas, and the Vidhan Parishad. And finally, we have the Municipal Corporations and the Panchayats, which are forms of local governance.

Our constitution makes a clear demarcation about legislative powers and jurisdictions. It is done through the three lists.

- Union List: This includes subjects that carry national importance, like defence, finance, railways, banking etc. So such subjects only the Central Government is allowed to make laws.

- State List: Includes all matters important to the functioning of a particular trade like transport, Trade, Commerce, agriculture etc. The state government is the deciding authority for framing laws on these subjects

- Concurrent List: This list includes topics on which both the Union and the state government can make laws. These are related to education, forests, trade unions etc. One point to be noted is if the two governments are in conflict with these laws, the decision of the Union Government will prevail, It is the final authority.

6.4.1 Advantages& Disadvantages of Federalism

When it comes to the system of federalism that we practice in the United States, there are many advantages as well as disadvantages. Some of the pros and cons of federalism will be given, with reasons as to why it is believed that the benefits of federalism out weight its detriments.

What are the advantages and disadvantages of federalism, as a form of government, and do the advantages outweigh the disadvantages? There are many advantages and disadvantages to our federal system of government, the benefits of which many believe outweigh the negatives. Below are the reasons why this may be the case, but before we dive into why the advantages may outweigh the disadvantages of federalism, let's first look at the list of the positives and negatives, the pros and cons, of federalism, many of which are listed elsewhere.

6.5 REGIONALISM IN INDIA

If the interest of one region or a state is asserted against the country as a whole or against another region/state in a hostile way, and if a conflict is promoted by such alleged interests, then it can be called as regionalism. If someone is aspiring to or make special efforts to develop one's state or region or to remove poverty & make social justice there, then that cannot be called as regionalism. Regionalism doesn't means defending the federal features of the constitution. Any demand for separate state, autonomous region or for devolution of power below the state level is also, sometimes confused as regionalism.

Roots of regionalism is in India's manifold diversity of languages, cultures, ethnic groups, communities, religions and so on, and encouraged by the regional concentration of those identity markers, and fueled by a sense of regional deprivation. For many centuries, India remained the land of many lands, regions, cultures and traditions. For instance, southern India (the home of Dravidian cultures), which is itself a region of many regions, is evidently different from the north, the west, the central and the north-east. Even the east of India is different from the North-East of India comprising today seven constituent units of Indian federation with the largest concentration of tribal people. Regionalism has remained perhaps the most potent force in Indian politics ever since independence (1947), if not before. It has remained the main basis of many regional political parties which have governed many states since the late 1960s. Three clear patterns can be identified in the post-independence phases of accommodation of regional identity through statehood.

First, in the 1950s and 1960s, intense (ethnic) mass mobilisation, often taking on a violent character, was the main force behind the state's response with an institutional package for statehood. Andhra Pradesh in India's south showed the way. The fast unto death in 1952 of the legendary (Telugu) leader Potti Sriramulu for a state for the Telegu-speakers out of the composite Madras Presidency moved an otherwise reluctant Jawaharlal Nehru, a top nationalist leader and it was followed by State reorganisation commission under Fazal Ali paving way for State Reorganization Act, 1956.

Second, in the 1970s and 1980s, the main focus of reorganization was India's North-east. The basis of reorganization was tribal insurgency for separation and statehood. The main institutional response of the Union government was the North-eastern States Reorganisation Act, 1971 which upgraded the Union Territories of Manipur and Tripura, and the Sub-State of Meghalaya to full statehood, and Mizoram and Arunachal Pradesh (then Tribal Districts) to Union Territories. The latter became states in 1986. Goa (based on Konkani language (8th Schedule)), which became a state in 1987, was the sole exception.

Third, the movements for the three new states (created in 2000)—Chhattisgarh out of Madhya Pradesh, Jharkhand out of Bihar and Uttaranchal out of Uttar Pradesh— were long-drawn but became vigorous in the 1990s. And the most recent one, we can see with the division of Andhra Pradesh, giving a separate Telangana, which started in 1950s.

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

3.   Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of federalism.

_____

_____

4.   Discuss the concept of regionalism.

_____

_____

6.6 POTENTIAL CAUSE FOR REGIONALISM

Regionalism could have flourished in India, if any state/region had felt that it was being culturally dominated or discriminated against.

Regional economic inequality is a potent time bomb directed against national unity and political stability. But, this potential cause did not take shape of regionalism, because of government steps, which focussed on the balanced regional development and fulfilled the aspiration of states.

Few of them are – Industrial Policy, 1956, National Integration council, 1961. Transfer of financial resources to poorer states on the

recommendation of Finance commission.

Planning became an important tool through Planning commission and Five year plans. But the new government is planning to devolve the planning power to the respective states, so that they can do planning with real-time approach of their respective needs and requirements.

The central government has categorized states on the basis of backwardness and accordingly gives grants and loans. In September 2013, Raghuram Rajan, recommended a new index of backwardness to determine- which state need special help from central government. It is composed of 10 equally weighted indicators. According to that, Orissa and Bihar are the most backward states.

Regular public investment by central government through centrally sponsored schemes have focussed on development of necessary infrastructure and poverty eradication, integrated rural development, education, health, family planning, etc. For example- Prdhan Mantri Gram sadka yojana, Mid day meal, MGNREGA, etc.

Government at centre and states give incentives to private players to develop in backward states through subsidies, taxation, etc. Nationalisation of banks, granting new banking licences, making mandatory for banks to open rural branches are few other steps for inclusive development and balanced regional development.

There are certain discrepancies at the implementation part of these schemes. Few areas have been neglected like irrigation, which has created agricultural disparity. Rain fed and dry land agriculture also have been neglected, which became cause for suicide of farmers in various states (Coverage of P. Sainath, gives us more insights on such issues.)In reality, the interstate industrial disparity, agricultural disparity, number of BPL, etc. are decreasing. But, more actions are needed to completely eradicate the disparities.

6.5.1. Why Regional disparity still persists?

Low rate of economic growth: The economic growth of India has been fluctuating since independence. But with respect to High population growth, the economic growth has been not enough to catch the development with full speed. In the last decade, the economic growth were progressive, but now they are reeling under the influence of world economic crisis and other bottlenecks at domestic level.

Socio-economic and political organisation of states: The states have been unable to do the adequate land reforms and the feudal mentality still persists. Bhoodan and Gramdaan movements, after independence, were not enthusiastically carried and even land under land Banks were not efficiently distributed. The political activities in the backward states were limited to vote bank politics and scams.

Lower level of infrastructural facilities in backward states: The level of infrastructural development, such as- power distribution, irrigation facilities, roads, modern markets for agricultural produce has been at back stage. All these are state list subjects.

Low level of social expenditure by states on education, health and sanitation: These subjects are core for human resource development. The sates which have invested heavily on these subjects, fall under the developed and advanced states, for example Tamil Nadu, where health care services in Primary health centre is bench mark for other states.

Political and administration failure: This is source of tension and gives birth to sub-regional movements for separate states. Jarkhand, Chattisgarh, Uttrakhand and recently Telangana are result of these failure only. Many such demands are in pipeline such as- Vidarbha, Saurashtra, Darjeeling and Bodoland, etc. These failures also weakens the confidence of private players and do not attract investors in the states.

"Son of the soil" doctrine explains a form of regionalism, which is in discussion since 1950. According to it, a state specifically belongs to the main linguistic group inhabiting it or that the state constitutes the exclusive homeland of its main language speakers, who are the sons of the soil or local residents.

Why son of the soil?

- There remains a competition for job between migrant and local educated middle class youth.

- This theory works mostly in cities, because here outsiders also, get opportunity for education, etc.

- In such theories, major involvement of people is due to rising aspiration.

- Economy's failure to create enough employment opportunity.

6.7 EFFECTS OF REGIONALISM IN INDIAN POLITICS

Regionalism has a very important role in indian politics. It is a major part of the country's politics because there has been political parties from different states catering or favouring their own people over the whole development of the nation instead. In Jammu and Kashmir their is the National conference, the party lead by former chief minister Mr Omar Abdullah, in Delhi we have our AAP Aam Admi party led by Mr Arvind Kejriwal, in west bengal there is the TMC (Trinamool Congress Party) a faction of the congress party headed by current chief minister of West Bengal Mamata Banerjee, in punjab we have our Akali dal who too is a party representing their fellow community and it goes down to each and every state. Uttar Pradesh, Bihar or Gujrat all fall as it contains regional parties of the likes of Samajwadi Party and Bahujan Samajwadi Party or RJD(Rashtriya Janata Dal) or the Bhartiya Janata Party who recently

became an all india party but previously it had its origin from gujrat, Shiv Sena is another example of regional party. The parliament as it is includes all the members of different political parties. The bill that is taken into discussion has to pass the parliament by a majority of the MP supporting it. But opposition party block the bill either by not supporting it or creating an environment of chaos in the parliament. When the congress party was in power we have seen the BJP MP stalling parliament trying to stop the FDI bill which was opposed by the congress party itself as the BJP was in power. So this lack of understanding and coordination and mistrust makes progress very difficult to achieve and stops the development of the country.

6.8 POLITICAL PARTIES IN INDIA

India has a multi-party system with recognition accorded to national and state and district level parties. The status is reviewed periodically by the Election Commission of India. Other political parties that wish to contest local, state or national elections are required to be registered by the Election Commission of India (ECI). Registered parties are upgraded as recognized national or state level parties based upon objective criteria. A recognized party enjoys privileges like a reserved party symbol, free broadcast time on state run tv and radio, a consultation in setting of election dates and giving input in setting electoral rules and regulations.

This listing is according to the 2014 Indian general election and Legislative Assembly elections and any party aspiring to state or national party status must fulfil at least one of the concerned criteria. In addition, national and state parties have to fulfil these conditions for all subsequent LokSabha or State elections, or else they lose their status. As per latest publication from Election Commission of India, the total number of parties registered was 1841, with 8 national parties, 52 state parties and 1785 unrecognised parties.

All registered parties contesting elections need to choose a symbol from a list of convenient symbols offered by the EC. All 29 states of the country along with the union territories of Pondicherry and the National

Capital Territory of Delhi have elected governments unless President's rule is imposed under certain conditions.

A registered party is recognised as a national party only if it fulfils any one of the following three conditions:

1. A party wins 2% of seats in the Lok Sabha from at least three different states.
2. At a general election to Lok Sabha or Legislative Assembly, the party polls 6% of votes in any four or more states and in addition it wins four Lok Sabha seats.
3. A party gets recognition as a state party in four states.

A party has to fulfil any of the following conditions for recognition as a state party:

1. A party should win minimum three percent of the total number of seats or a minimum of three seats in the Legislative Assembly.
2. A party should win at least one seat in the Lok Sabha for every 25 seats or any fraction thereof allotted to that State.
3. A party should secure at least six percent of the total valid votes polled during general election to a Lok Sabha or State Legislative Assembly and should, in addition, win at least one Lok Sabha, and two Legislative Assembly seats in that election,
4. Under the liberalized criteria, one more clause that it will be eligible for recognition as state party if it secures 8% or more of the total valid votes polled in the state, addition to one seat in any state.

6.8.1. Advantages and Disadvantages of Political Parties

Political parties are groups of people who come together because they share a mutual vision for their community. These parties can form at local, regional, or national levels. These groups meet together regularly, create platforms that represent their vision and values, and then send members to run for political office.

Organization is the primary advantage that a political party provides. With these parties in place, the politics at any level can be evaluated by each voting member of society to determine if they also share the values of the party. At the same time, it allows for the best possible candidate to represent a certain set of values or ideas to run for office.

Compromise is the primary disadvantage of political parties. Many political parties are run by a director or an executive team and will often influence or direct the party platform. Those who wish to join with the political party must then agree with the platform, even if it doesn't quite fit their needs, forcing them to compromise instead of the leadership.

There are additional advantages and disadvantages of political parties to think about as well.

The Advantages of Political Parties

1. Political parties encourage public participation.
Political parties, when structured within a representative form of government, encourage the average person to be politically active. They ask for people to become informed about specific situations that are happening within society so they can take a stand on those issues. Debates allow for people to express opinions or share ideas to formulate an informed opinion. Many political parties will even encourage members to run for political office at all levels of government.

2. Political parties create checks and balances.
In the United States, with two major political parties, the system is designed to bring politicians together so that negotiations occur over legislation. In other systems of government with multiple major political parties, negotiations over power and leadership are required to form a majority government. The goal of forming political parties is to create a system of checks and balances to prevent one person or one group from grabbing too much power in representative governments.

3. Political parties distribute information throughout society.
In many elections, political parties are a primary source of information

for current and future legislations. It's the once chance for the general population to work with politicians to begin crafting a vision for the future. Although the voters must continue to press their politicians to stay true to their word in a representative form of government, they have access through the political party to do so.

4. Political parties water down special interest investments.

Without political parties, whomever had the most money to contribute would likely win elections and influence society. Political parties allow people with similar values or interests to congregate together to counter the monetary influences. That doesn't mean special interests won't work to persuade politicians through the party system – they do. The presence of the party means that the majority, the voters, have an opportunity to band together to counter the paid influences.

5. Political parties help decisions be made quicker.

The state of politics in the United States in 2017 might make it seem like this isn't an advantage of political parties, but it generally is. When people can come together within the boundaries of the party, they can debate ideas and create legislation or policies that benefit everyone faster than if they were forced to do it themselves. The party must be managed properly for this advantage to appear, however, and that is often why this key point is not always seen.

6. Political parties create connections.

People are naturally attracted to others who share similar beliefs and ideas. This attraction allows people to network with one another, creating connections they might not have otherwise made. Involvement in a preferred party can mean
making new friends, traveling new places, and being able to work toward making the world a better place.

The Disadvantages of Political Parties

1. **Political parties can be abusive.**

    Not every government is a representative form of government.

Communism has political parties. Dictatorships often use political parties. The purpose of the parties in these instances is usually more about enforcement of laws and expectations instead of being politically active from an individualized perspective. If a political party has too much strength or leverage within a society, it can become abusive.

2. Political parties encourage polarization.

Political parties do bring people together, but they also tear people apart. The platforms offered by each party are increasingly presented as an all-or-nothing scenario. There is also a certain level of righteousness assigned to that platform, making those who disagree with it be perceived as "wrong." Those who agree with it are perceived as "right." Political parties may encourage opinions, but only if those opinions agree with the platform.

3. Political parties prioritize themselves.

In 2016, the total cost of the U.S. election was an estimated $6.4 billion, according to information from Open Secrets. The cost of the Presidential race was $2.38 billion. In 2012, those figures were $6.2 billion and $2.6 billion respectively. Just one election in the United States, at those figures, is enough to solve most world hunger issues for an entire year. That means the goal of most political parties is to prioritize themselves so they can be in power. Political parties see these costs as investments.

4. Political parties sacrifice individuality.

Personal opinions are important. We learn from individual experiences. In the structure of a political party, however, the individual voice is often drowned out by the group voice. If enough voices are loud enough, a minority of people within the party can lead the entire group toward a new direction. Because group voices are louder, there tends to be less attention paid to concerned individual voices – even if the observations or information being provided would benefit everyone.

5. Political parties invite corruption.

If a person can be given a large enough and loud enough platform, they

can influence the direction of an entire election, community, or nation. Their very structure, where individuals influence group voices to lead the party in a specific direction, invites corruption. Allegations of corruption are frequent in political systems because a few typically hold power over many and special interest groups want their message to get out to as many people as possible.

The advantages and disadvantages of political parties show us that organization, management, and an open mind are the three primary traits required for society to benefit the most from this structure. Although political parties will always create division and polarization at some level since different ideas are represented, it will also always be a way for people to come together to learn something new too.

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

5. Discuss the effects of regionalism in Indian politics.

_____

_____

_____

6. Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of Indian politics.

_____

_____

6.9 LET US SUM UP

Federalism is at its core a system where the dual machinery of government functions. For example, our Indian Constitution says that India too is a federal country. Known to all we have two levels of parliament, the at center the Union government and at State level, we have the individual State governments.

Leading examples of the federation or federal state include the United States, India, Brazil, Mexico, Russia, Germany, Canada, Switzerland, Argentina, and Australia. Some also today characterize the European Union as the pioneering example of federalism in a multi-state setting, in a concept termed the federal union of states.

1. The essential feature, which is the definition of federalism is that there are two levels of governance in the country at least. There can even be more. But the entire power is not concentrated with one government.

2. When it comes to the system of federalism that we practice in the United States, there are many advantages as well as disadvantages. Some of the pros and cons of federalism will be given, with reasons as to why it is believed that the benefits of federalism out weight its detriments.

Regionalism has a very important role in Indian politics. It is a major part of the countries politics because there has been political parties from different states catering or favouring their own people over the whole development of the nation instead. In Jammu and Kashmir there is the National conference, the party lead by former chief minister Mr Omar Abdullah, in Delhi we have our AAP Aam Admi Party led by Mr Arvind Kejriwal, in west bengal there is the TMC (Trinamool Congress Party) a faction of the congress party headed by current chief minister of West Bengal Mamata Banerjee, in Punjab we have our Akali dal who too is a party representing their fellow community and it goes down to each and every state

India has a multi-party system with recognition accorded to national and state and district level parties. The condition is reviewed periodically by the Election Commission of India. Other political parties that wish to contest local, state or national elections are required to be registered by the Election Commission of India (ECI). Registered parties are upgraded as recognized national or state level parties based upon objective criteria.

6.10 KEYWORDS

- Federalism: Federalism is compound mode of two governments.

- Regionalism: If the interest of one region or a state is asserted against the country as a whole or against another region/state in a hostile way, and if a conflict is promoted by such alleged interests, then it can be called as regionalism.

- Advantages and disadvantages: When it comes to the system of federalism that we practice in the United States, there are many advantages as well as disadvantages.

- Political parties: India has a multi-party system with recognition accorded to national and state and district level parties. The status is reviewed periodically by the Election Commission of India.

6.11 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. Discuss the concept of federalism.

2. Discuss the features of federalism.

3. Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of federalism.

4. Discuss the concept of regionalism.

5. Discuss the effects of regionalism in Indian politics.

6. Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of Indian politics.

6.12 SUGGESTED READINGS AND REFERENCES

- P.-J. Proudhon, The Principle of Federation, 1863.
- A Comparative Bibliography: Regulatory Competition on Corporate Law
- A Rhetoric for Ratification: The Argument of the Federalist and its Impact on Constitutional Interpretation
- Brainstorming National (in French)

- "Registration of political Parties". FAQs. Election Commission of India. Retrieved 21 January 2013.
- **a b c** "Names of National, State, registered-unrecognised parties and the list of free symbols" (PDF). Election Commission of India. 12 March 2014. Archived from the original (PDF) on 22 May 2015. Retrieved 8 May 2015.
- **a b c d** "State Party List" (PDF). Election Commission of India

6.13 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. Federalism is compound mode of two governments. That is, in one system there will be a mixture of two governments – state government with central government. In India, we can describe federalism as a distribution of authority around local, national, and state governments. This is similar to Canadian model of political organization.

Federalism is at its core a structure where the dual machinery of government functions. Generally, under federalism, there are two levels of government. One is a central authority which looks after the major affairs of the country. The other is more of a local government which looks after the day to day functioning and activities of their particular region.

For example, our Indian Constitution says that India too is a federal country. As you know we have two levels of parliament, the at center the Union government and at State level, we have the individual State governments.

Federalism is the mixed or compound mode of government, combining a general government (the central or "federal" government) with regional governments (provincial, state, cantonal, territorial or other sub-unit governments) in a single political system. Its distinctive feature, exemplified in the founding example of modern federalism by the United States under the Constitution of 1787, is a relationship of parity between the two levels of government established. Federalism can thus be defined as a form of government in which there is a division of powers, between two levels of government of equal status.

2. These characteristics combined to reflect the true essence of federalism.

The essential feature, which is the definition of federalism is that there are two levels of governance in the country at least. There can even be more. But the entire power is not concentrated with one government.

All levels of governance will govern the same citizens, but their jurisdiction will be different. This means that each level of government will have a specific power to form laws, legislate and execute these laws. Both of the governments will have clearly marked jurisdiction. It will not be that one of the government is just a figurehead government.

Another important feature is that the constitution must guarantee this federal system of government. Which means the powers and duties of both or all governments must be listed down in the constitution of that country hence guaranteeing a federal system of governance.

As stated above the federalism of a country must be prescribed by the constitution. But it is also important that just one level of government cannot make unilateral changes or amendments to the important and essential provisions of the constitution. Such changes must be approved by all the levels of the government to be carried through.

Now there are two levels of government with separate jurisdictions and separate duties. Yet there is still a possibility that a conflict may arise between the two. Well in a federal state, it will fall upon the courts or rather the judiciary to resolve this conflict. The courts must have the power to interfere in such a situation and reach a resolution.

While there is power sharing between the two levels of government, there should also be a system in place for revenue sharing. Both levels of government should have their own autonomous revenue streams. Because if one such government depends on the other for funds to carry out its functions, it really is not autonomous in its true nature.

3. When it comes to the system of federalism that we practice in the United States, there are many advantages as well as disadvantages. Some of the pros and cons of federalism will be given, with reasons as to why it is believed that the benefits of federalism out weight its detriments.

What are the advantages and disadvantages of federalism, as a form of government, and do the advantages outweigh the disadvantages? There are many advantages and disadvantages to our federal system of government, the benefits of which many believe outweigh the negatives. Below are the reasons why this may be the case, but before we dive into why the advantages may outweigh the disadvantages of federalism, let's first look at the list of the positives and negatives, the pros and cons, of federalism, many of which are listed elsewhere.

4. If the interest of one region or a state is asserted against the country as a whole or against another region/state in a hostile way, and if a conflict is promoted by such alleged interests, then it can be called as regionalism.

If someone is aspiring to or make special efforts to develop one's state or region or to remove poverty & make social justice there, then that cannot be called as regionalism. Regionalism doesn't means defending the federal features of the constitution. Any demand for separate state, autonomous region or for devolution of power below the state level is also, sometimes confused as regionalism.

Roots of regionalism is in India's manifold diversity of languages, cultures, ethnic groups, communities, religions and so on, and encouraged by the regional concentration of those identity markers, and fueled by a sense of regional deprivation. For many centuries, India remained the land of many lands, regions, cultures and traditions.

5. Regionalism has a very important role in Indian politics. It is a major part of the countries politics because there has been political parties from different states catering or favouring their own people over the whole development of the nation instead. In Jammu and Kashmir there is the National conference, the party lead by former chief minister Mr Omar Abdullah, in Delhi we have our AAP Aam Admi Party led by Mr Arvind

Kejriwal, in west Bengal there is the TMC (Trinamool Congress Party) a faction of the congress party headed by current chief minister of West Bengal Mamata Banerjee, in Punjab we have our Akali dal who too is a party representing their fellow community and it goes down to each and every state. Uttar Pradesh, Bihar or Gujrat all fall as it contains Regional Parties of the likes of Samajwadi Party and Bahujan Samajwadi Party or RJD (Rashtriya Janata Dal) or the Bhartiya Janata Party who recently became an all India Party but previously it had its origin from Gujrat, Shiv Sena is another example of Regional Party. The parliament as it is includes all the members of different political parties. The bill that is taken into discussion has to pass the parliament by a majority of the MP supporting it. But opposition party block the bill either by not supporting it or creating an environment of chaos in the parliament. When the congress party was in power we have seen the BJP MP stalling parliament trying to stop the FDI bill which was opposed by the congress party itself as the BJP was in power. So this lack of understanding and coordination and mistrust makes progress very difficult to achieve and stops the development of the country.

6. The Disadvantages of Political Parties

1. **Political parties can be abusive.**

   Not every government is a representative form of government. Communism has political parties. Dictatorships often use political parties. The purpose of the parties in these instances is usually more about enforcement of laws and expectations instead of being politically active from an individualized perspective. If a political party has too much strength or leverage within a society, it can become abusive.

2. Political parties encourage polarization.

Political parties do bring people together, but they also tear people apart. The platforms offered by each party are increasingly presented as an all-or-nothing scenario. There is also a certain level of righteousness assigned to that platform, making those who disagree with it be perceived as "wrong." Those who agree with it are perceived as "right." Political parties may encourage opinions, but only if those opinions agree with the platform.

3. Political parties prioritize themselves.

In 2016, the total cost of the U.S. election was an estimated $6.4 billion, according to information from Open Secrets. The cost of the Presidential race was $2.38 billion. In 2012, those figures were $6.2 billion and $2.6 billion respectively. Just one election in the United States, at those figures, is enough to solve most world hunger issues for an entire year. That means the goal of most political parties is to prioritize themselves so they can be in power. Political parties see these costs as investments.

4. Political parties sacrifice individuality.

Personal opinions are important. We learn from individual experiences. In the structure of a political party, however, the individual voice is often drowned out by the group voice. If enough voices are loud enough, a minority of people within the party can lead the entire group toward a new direction. Because group voices are louder, there tends to be less attention paid to concerned individual voices – even if the observations or information being provided would benefit everyone.

5. Political parties invite corruption.

If a person can be given a large enough and loud enough platform, they can influence the direction of an entire election, community, or nation. Their very structure, where individuals influence group voices to lead the party in a specific

direction, invites corruption. Allegations of corruption are frequent in political systems because a few typically hold power over many and special interest groups want their message to get out to as many people as possible.

The advantages and disadvantages of political parties show us that organization, management, and an open mind are the three primary traits required for society to benefit the most from this structure. Although political parties will always create division and polarization at some level since different ideas are represented, it will also always be a way for people to come together to learn something new too.

UNIT – 7 PHASES OF ELECTORAL POLITICS

STRUCTURE

7.0 OBJECTIVES

After studying this unit, you should be able to:

- Learn about the concept of electoral politics
- Understand what is the minimum conditions of a democratic election
- Phases of electoral politics

7.1 INTRODUCTION

Elections in India, the world's second-most populous country, evoke descriptions like 'spectacle' or 'carnival,' in part due to the overwhelming numbers that participate in the process. In this country of over a billion people, 714 million voters will decide who rules the world's largest democracy for the next five years. In the 2004 elections,

over 5,400 candidates from 230 political parties participated. Nearly the same number of candidates will compete for seats in parliament in 2009. Electoral candidates vie for votes by promising reforms, such as better governance, greater socioeconomic equity, and bolstered efforts at poverty alleviation. However, corrupt politicians with criminal records, caste- and religion-based politics, and allegations of vote-buying continue to mar the democratic process. Meanwhile, the coalition politics of the last two decades, while more inclusive, have resulted in giving outsized power to small parties that have used it to further their short-term agendas.

7.2 CONCEPT OF ELECTORAL POLITICS

Election is a device through which a modern state creates among its citizens a sense of involvement and participation in public affairs. A good electoral system is the bedrock of genuine representative government. Much depends on how the system operates in practice, whether competent and honest administrators free from political bias conduct elections efficiently and impartially. The absence of general confidence in the verdict of the ballot may destroy the faith of public in the democratic process. Stressing the importance of electoral process, Pollock observed, "Unless public elections are conducted with accuracy and efficiency, not only the public services are discredited but the whole democratic system is endangered."

India is a constitutional democracy with a parliamentary system of government, and at the heart of the system is a commitment to hold regular, free and fair elections. These elections determine the composition of the government, the membership of the two houses of parliament, the state and union territory legislative assemblies, and the Presidency and vice- presidency.

7.3 FUNCTIONS OF ELECTORAL SYSTEM IN INDIA

The Parliament

India's parliamentary system is based on the Westminster model of constitutional democracy, a legacy of British colonial rule. The Parliament is comprised of a bicameral legislature: the Rajya Sabha, the 250-member upper house, where members are elected by state legislative assemblies (12 members are nominated by the president), and the Lok Sabha, the 543-member lower house directly elected by the people (with two additional seats reserved for Anglo Indians nominated by the president). In the Lok Sabha, voters elect candidates based on the electoral system where the person securing the largest number of votes in each district wins. To ensure political representation for historically marginalized groups in the lower house of the parliament, the Indian Constitution stipulates that each state reserve seats for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (formerly known as the untouchables, lowest in the country's stratified social order) in proportion to their population in the state. This means only candidates belonging to these groups can contest elections in reserved constituencies. In the 2009 elections, eighty-four seats for candidates from scheduled castes and forty-seven for scheduled tribe members are reserved, 24 percent of the total seats in the parliament's lower house. A pending bill seeking a 33 percent reservation for women in the parliament and state legislatures has been the subject of intense debate for over a decade.

The prime minister is the leader of the party or alliance that enjoys majority support in the lower house.

The Parties Currently, India has hundreds of political parties registered with the election commission, and of these seven are registered as national parties. The Indian National Congress and its rival the Bharatiya Janata Party are the largest among them.

The Role of Caste

When universal adult suffrage offered all social groups, including previously disenfranchised ones, the right to vote, caste emerged as one of the most significant issues for political mobilization. This, political theorist Pratap Bhanu Mehta writes in the 2003 book *The Burden of Democracy,* was in part because caste was "an axis of

domination and subordination in Indian society" and the state, by sanctioning categories of caste, provided the incentives to mobilize. But he argues it was also because "there were few other competing ideologies that allowed people to make sense of their social circumstances in the way caste did."

However, caste politics in the last three decades have been marked by desire for power rather than a substantial agenda for social reform. Parties like BSP and RJD, which came to power by mobilizing lower castes, have failed to offer much in the way of good governance or long-term social transformation. Instead, once some lower-caste groups have gained access to power, they have then sought to confine those privileges to their sub-caste. The problem, though, is not the salience of caste in Indian politics, but the failure to address its underlying causes and create new opportunities for marginalized groups, say some experts. "Unless the newly mobilized Dalit castes can be given access to the gains of the market economy, their prospects for social advancement remain dim," Mehta writes. Analysts note caste plays a lesser role in urban India, and with higher urbanization, its role in electoral politics might decline.

Playing the Religion Card

Many Indian historians date religion's role in Indian politics back to the colonial period and the 1909 British policy of establishing separate electorates based on religion. However, in the 1980s, several events worked to bring religion to the forefront of electoral politics, say experts: rising Sikh fundamentalism followed by anti-Sikh riots after the 1984 assassination of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi; Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi's decision to support legislation that overturned a 1985 Supreme Court judgment to grant alimony to a Muslim Woman, seen by many as capitulation to Muslim orthodoxy in an election year; and the rise of the BJP and its call to destroy the Babri mosque in Ayodhya. The debate in Kashmir and several bloody Hindu-Muslim flare-ups in the last two decades have further divided people along religious lines.

Today, both the Hindus and the country's 170 million Muslims, the largest minority group, are courted energetically by political parties.

"Religion is part and parcel of Indian political life," says Sumit Ganguly, a professor of political science at Indiana University. He says the BJP is the principal offender with its Hindutva agenda. But Congress is not free of culpability either, he argues. Regional actors such as Maharashtra's Shiv Sena further exploit religion to court voters. Ganguly says lack of leadership in upper echelons of the Muslim community exacerbates the difficulty. The Indian electorate has turned the standard law of political participation on its head. While it is clear that religion plays a significant role, it is less clear how it translates into voting behaviour. "Politically speaking, there is no single unified Muslim community in India," writes Yogendra Yadav (BBC), a political scientist who designed and coordinated the National Election Studies, the largest series of academic surveys of the Indian electorate, from 1996 to 2004. He argues that "Muslims are fragmented along the lines of religion, sect, caste, and community." Ganguly says economic issues are also intertwined with issues of religion and caste. Indian Muslims, who experience high poverty rates, voted for Congress for decades because of its secular platform and promised reforms. Unlike most minorities in most democracies around the world, Indian Muslims, Yadav says, have not voted for Muslim parties. Nor do they vote en bloc, "like, say, the black vote in the United States for the Democratic Party or the UK's ethnic minorities who largely vote for the Labour Party," he says.

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.   Discuss the concept of electoral politics.

_____

_____

_____

2.   Explain the roll of caste in electoral system.

_____

_____

7.4 OUR SYSTEM OF ELECTION

Electoral systems are the detailed constitutional arrangements and voting systems that convert the vote into a political decision. The first step is to tally the votes, for which various vote counting systems and ballot types are used. Voting methods then determine the result on the basis of the tally. Most systems can be categorized as either proportional or majoritarian. Among the former are party-list proportional representation and additional member system. Among the latter are First Past the Post electoral system (relative majority) and absolute majority. Many countries have growing electoral reform movements, which advocate systems such as approval voting, single transferable vote, instant runoff voting or a Condorcet method; these methods are also gaining popularity for lesser elections in some countries where more important elections still use more traditional counting methods.

While openness and accountability are usually considered cornerstones of a democratic system, the act of casting a vote and the content of a voter's ballot are usually an important exception. The secret ballot is a relatively modern development, but it is now considered crucial in most free and fair elections, as it limits the effectiveness of intimidation.

Scheduling

The essence of democracy is that elected officials are accountable to the people, and they must return to the voters at prescribed intervals to seek their mandate to continue in office. For that reason most democratic constitutions provide that elections are held at fixed regular intervals. In the United States, elections for public offices are typically held between every two and six years in most states and at the federal level, with exceptions for elected judicial positions that may have longer terms of office. There is a variety of schedules, for example presidents: the President of Ireland is elected every seven years, the President of

Russia and the President of Finland every six years, the President of France every five years, President of the United States every four years.

Pre-decided or fixed election dates have the advantage of fairness and predictability. However, they tend to greatly lengthen campaigns, and make dissolving the legislature (parliamentary system) more problematic if the date should happen to fall at time when dissolution is inconvenient (e.g. when war breaks out). Other states (e.g., the United Kingdom) only set maximum time in office, and the executive decides exactly when within that limit it will actually go to the polls. In practice, this means the government remains in power for close to its full term, and choose an election date it calculates to be in its best interests (unless something special happens, such as a motion of no-confidence). This calculation be based on a number of variables, such as its performance in opinion polls and the size of its majority.

Election campaigns

When elections are called, politicians and their supporters attempt to influence policy by competing directly for the votes of constituents in what are called campaigns. Followers for a campaign can be either formally organized or loosely affiliated, and frequently utilize campaign advertising. It is common for political scientists to attempt to predict elections via Political Forecasting methods.

Difficulties with elections

In many of the countries with weak rule of law, the most common reason why elections do not meet international standards of being "free and fair" is interference from the incumbent government. Dictators may use the powers of the executive (police, martial law, censorship, physical implementation of the election mechanism, etc.) to remain in power despite popular opinion in favour of removal. Members of a particular faction in a legislature may use the power of the majority or supermajority (passing criminal laws, defining the electoral mechanisms including eligibility and district boundaries) to stop the balance of power in the body from shifting to a rival faction due to an election.

Non-governmental entities can also interfere with elections, through physical force, verbal intimidation, or fraud, which can result in

improper casting or counting of votes. Monitoring for and minimizing electoral fraud is also an ongoing task in countries with strong traditions of free and fair elections. Problems that prevent an election from being "free and fair" take various forms.

Lack of open political debate or an informed electorate

The electorate may be poorly enlightened about issues or candidates due to lack of freedom of the press, lack of objectivity in the press due to state or corporate control, and/or lack of access to news and political media. Freedom of speech may be curtailed by the state, favouring certain viewpoints or state propaganda.

The working of Indian electoral system has witnessed several drawbacks and malpractices. The discrepancy between the votes cast for a party and the seats won in parliament, the multiplicity of political parties, personality cult in party system, exploitation of caste and communal loyalties, role of muscle and money power, misuse of governmental machinery, fraudulent practices like booth-capturing, intimidation and impersonation of voters are important drawbacks of Indian electoral system.

Election malpractices range from the physical capturing of booths to the organisation of youth wings of parties or goon squads who could target and terrorise particular communities before the poll to prevent them from voting. Even the poll staff is either bribed into active connivance or intimidated into passive acquiescence. The menace of booth capturing has been in vogue since the second general election of 1957, especially in Bihar. The phenomenon gradually spread over the country in different forms and dimensions.

The rising need for the muscle power in elections necessitated more input of money too. Earlier voters used to be bribed individually, and then it was found to be more convenient to buy musclemen who could ensure victory by capturing booth or intimidating voters rather than buying individual voters. This has led to progressive criminalisation of politics and the emergence of politician-underworld nexus. Gradually, the criminals themselves have started contesting elections instead of helping others. At times, the politicians found it necessary to politicise the bureaucracy. This can be gauged from the scale on which most of the

high officials are changed with the change of a government. This is done to condition the bureaucracy to act in favour of the ruling party during elections. The official machinery is used to collect information on political rivals. The official machinery come handy in hiring crowds, intimidating targeted sections of voters, creating local tensions, conditioning staff for poll duties, enrolling additional voters or removing certain names from there, etc. They also, in turn, allow the bureaucracy to make money so that they remain vulnerable. In the process significant sections of bureaucracy get incorporated into the politician-underworld-bureaucracy nexus. In its efforts to cleanse the electoral process, the EC has put a ban on transfers and promotions after the elections are announced. Although significant, the measure is of limited value as the final dispositions of the bureaucracy are usually made much in advance. Other practices of misuse have also been banned under model code of conduct that has come to be more strictly enforced since T.N. Seshan days.

Electioneering tends to be an expensive exercise. In a vast country like India this is more so because the electoral constituency is usually very large both in terms of size and population. With mass illiteracy, a candidate is required to make extensive personal contacts with the voters, which involve enormous expenditure. One important reason for the elections to have become so expensive in our times is the growing distance of political parties from the people. Transport, publicity and maintaining the campaigners involve enormous amount. The desire to win an election at any cost and the increasing reliance on the muscle power in elections have necessitated unbelievably enormous expenditures collected through dubious means, by the political parties and their candidates.

The gap between expenses incurred in an election and legally permitted limit on expenses is also increasing with time. Ceilings on campaign expenses being low, black money in form of donations to election fund of political parties or powerful leaders have come to be an established fact. It is estimated that 90 per cent of all election funds comes from the big business houses in expectation of special favours or patronage. This not only eliminates men and women of

ability and integrity from electoral contest for lack of financial support but also promotes criminalisation of politics.

7.5 THE ELECTORAL ROLL

The electoral roll of a constituency is a list of all those people in that constituency who are registered to vote in the elections. Only those people whose names are there in the electoral rolls are allowed to vote as 'electors'. The electoral roll is normally revised every year to add the names of those who are not less than 18 on a qualifying date years as on the first day of January of that year, or have moved into the constituency, and to remove the names of those who have died or moved out of the constituency. The updating of electoral rolls is a continuous process, which is interrupted only at the time of the elections during the period from after the last date of filing nominations till the completion of the elections. The administrative machinery involved in the preparation, maintenance and revision of the electoral rolls has the ECI at the top of the hierarchy. According to Section 13B of the Representation of the People Act, 1950, the electoral roll for each constituency in a State/UT is to be prepared and revised by an Electoral Registration Officer (ERO). At the bottom of the hierarchy, Booth Level Officers (BLOs) and supervisors are also appointed. Each BLO has one or two polling stations under his/her jurisdiction. During the revision of the electoral rolls, BLOs may be assigned the tasks of enumeration, the verification of rolls and forms, and the collection of forms and photographs from the electors for Electoral Photo Identity Card (EPIC) and photo roll maximisation. BLOs hand over the forms thus collected to the designated officers and EROs for further action. During the time when continuous revision and updating is going on, BLOs may be used for the identification of dead and shifted voters on specified dates prescribed for the purpose by the ECI (one week in each half of a year). In an election year, a BLO's task begins with the publication of the draft rolls till the completion of the second Supplement according to a specific programme approved by the ECI. Supervisory officers maintain checks on the quality of work done by the BLOs, and closely monitor it. Each Supervisory Officer has

10-20 BLOs under his/her supervision. Apart from the machinery involved in the process of the preparation and revision of the electoral rolls, community participation has also been identified as one of the ways in which political parties can appoint their representatives as Booth Level Agents (BLAs) on the pattern of appointment of Polling Agents, to complement the task of BLOs. Normally, one BLA may be appointed for each part of the electoral roll. The BLA must be a registered elector in the relevant part of the electoral roll for which he/she is appointed, as it is expected that the BLA will scrutinise the entries in the draft roll of the area where he/she resides, in order to identify the entries of dead persons and shifted persons.

COMPUTERISATION OF ROLLS

The Election Commission has undertaken the computerisation of all electoral rolls throughout India, which has led to improvements in the accuracy and speed with which the electoral roll can be updated.

ELECTORS' PHOTO IDENTITY CARDS

The Electoral Photo Identity Card (EPIC) is an identity document issued by the electoral registration officer. The EPIC contains details of the elector like name, father's/mother's/husband's name, date of birth/ age on the qualifying date, sex, address, and most importantly, the photograph of the elector. EPIC is a permanent document for an elector. It is to be used by the elector to establish one's identity at the time of polls. It is compulsory for an elector who has been issued an EPIC to produce the EPIC at the time of polling to enable voting. For a long time, impersonation had been one of the many ills plaguing the electoral system of our country. With the intention of preventing impersonation at polls, the Commission had, in the years 1994-95, introduced the EPIC to identify the voters at the time of polls. The Commission has always been trying its best to raise the coverage of issuing EPICs to 100%, but due to a significant number of new additions to the electors' list, the death of existing electors and migration of people from one place to another, the target has not been achieved, so far in a few States. Therefore, the

Commission allows certain alternative documents like government I-cards, passports, PAN cards, driving license, bank/post office account passbook, property documents, SC/ST/OBC certificate, pension documents, freedom fighter identity card, arms license, certificate of the physically handicapped, job cards issued under NREGA and health insurance scheme smart cards to establish the identity of the electors in the polling stations. The present coverage of EPIC at the national level has been above 99%.

SCHEDULING OF ELECTION

The election process starts with the issue of notification for the Parliamentary Constituencies and Assembly Constituencies. As per legal provisions, a period of seven days is provided for the filing of nominations after the notification is issued. The scrutiny of the nominations is carried out on the day following the last date for nominations. Thereafter, two days are provided for the withdrawal of nominations and the final list of candidates is prepared after the withdrawal. The campaign period is usually of 14 days or more, and the campaign comes to an end 48 hours before the close of the polls in the respective constituencies.

DEPLOYMENT OF POLLING PERSONNEL

Another important aspect is the deployment of poll personnel. This is done through a three-stage randomisation process, which is as follows:

First Stage: At this stage, the purpose is to identify and select the required number of polling personnel for the District. In the appointment letter the identity of the Assembly Constituency (AC) is not to be disclosed. Polling personnel will know whether he/she is a Presiding Officer or a Polling Officer (PO), the venue and time of training. The presence of Observers is not required at this stage.

Second Stage: Polling parties are formed at this stage. The AC may be known, but the actual Polling Station (PS) is not known. Observers must be present. This randomisation is not to be done before 6/7 days from the day of the poll.

Third Stage: At the time of the dispersal of the polling party, the allocation of the PS is done. The presence of Observers is a must and the certificate regarding the formation of polling parties on the basis of the three-stage randomisation process needs to be given by the DEO to the ECI and separately to the CEO.

In the 2014 General Elections, the arrangements at the polling stations were reviewed and instructions were issued to have a minimum guaranteed environ at the polling stations, comprising certain Basic Minimum Facilities (BMF) such as drinking water, shade/shelter, light, ramps and so on. The voting compartment was standardised for all States and UTs by issuing instructions to set them up in such a way that the secrecy of the ballot was not compromised and prohibited materials such as jute bags and plastic sheets were not used.

WHO CAN STAND FOR ELECTION

Any Indian citizen who is registered as a voter is otherwise not disqualified under the Law and is over 25 years of age is allowed to contest elections to the Lok Sabha or State Legislative Assemblies. For the Rajya Sabha the age limit is 30 years. Candidates for Vidhan Sabha should be residents of the same state from which they wish to contest. Every candidate has to make deposit of Rs. 25,000/- for Lok Sabha election and Rs. 10,000/- for Rajya Sabha or Vidhan Sabha elections, except for candidates from the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes who pay half of these amounts. The deposit is returned if the candidate receives more than one-sixth of the total number of valid votes polled in the constituency. Nominations must be supported at least by one registered elector of the constituency, in the case of a candidate sponsored by a recognised Party and by ten registered electors from the constituency in case of other candidates. Returning Officers, appointed by the Election Commission, are put in charge to receive nominations of candidates in each constituency, and oversee the formalities of the election. In a number of seats in the Lok Sabha and the Vidhan Sabha, the candidates can only be from either one of the scheduled castes or scheduled tribes. The number of these reserved seats is meant to be approximately in proportion to the number of people from scheduled castes or scheduled tribes in each state. There are currently 84 seats

reserved for the scheduled castes and 47 reserved for the scheduled tribes in the Lok Sabha.

NOMINATION & CAMPAIGN

The campaign is the period when the political parties and candidates put forward their arguments with which they hope to persuade people to vote for them. Candidates are given a week to put forward their nominations. These are scrutinised by the Returning Officers and if not found to be in order can be rejected after a summary hearing. Validly nominated candidates can withdraw within two days after nominations have been scrutinised. The official campaign lasts for above two weeks from the drawing up of the list of nominated candidates, and officially ends 48 hours before polling closes. Once an election has been called, parties issue manifestos detailing the programmes they wish to implement if elected to government, the strengths of their leaders, and the failures of opposing parties and their leaders. Slogans are used to popularise and identify parties and issues, and pamphlets and posters distributed to the electorate

MODEL CODE OF CONDUCT

During the election campaign the political parties and contesting candidates are expected to abide by a Model Code of Conduct evolved by the Election Commission on the basis of a consensus among political parties. The Model Code lays down broad guidelines as to how the political parties and candidates should conduct themselves during the election campaign. It is intended to maintain the election campaign on healthy lines, avoid clashes and conflicts between political parties or their supporters and to ensure peace and order during the campaign period and thereafter, until the results are declared. The Model Code also prescribes guidelines for the ruling party either at the Centre or in the State to ensure that a level field is maintained and that no cause is given for any complaint that the ruling party has used its official position for the purposes of its election campaign.

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

3.   Discuss the two main topics of election system.

_____

4.   Highlights the main points of the election roll.

_____

_____

7.6 ELECTORAL REFORMS

The need of electoral reforms was felt quite early in India. The various committees and commissions appointed by the parliament, government and opposition parties have made attempts in this regard. First such major effort for electoral reforms was made in 1971, when a Joint Parliamentary Committee on Amendments to Election Law was appointed under the chairmanship of Jagannath Rao, which submitted its report in 1972.

In 1974, Jayaprakash Narayan as president of the Citizens for Democracy (CFD) set up a committee under the chairmanship of Justice V.M. Tarkunde for electoral reforms. This committee popularly known as Tarkunde committee was asked to suggest measures to combat among other things the various forms of corrupt practice like the use of money and muscle power, misuse of official machinery and the disparity between the votes polled and the number of seats won, etc. Tarkunde committee submitted its report in February 1975. On the basis of this report, J.P. launched the people's movement against corruption and for electoral reforms and presented the People's Charter to the presiding officers of both Houses of Parliament on March 6, 1975. Urging the Parliament and assemblies to be more responsive to popular aspirations, the charter demanded that the unanimous recommendations of the Joint Parliamentary Committee on Electoral Reforms be implemented without delay.

The Janata Party after assuming power in 1977 constituted a cabinet sub-committee on electoral reforms headed by the then Union Home Minister Charan Singh. At the same time, the CEC S.L. Shakdhar made significant suggestions on various issues ranging from election expenses to booth capturing. An agreement to reduce voting age from 21 to 18 years was also reached. But the Janata Party government fell before it could initiate any electoral reform.

The National Front government under V.P. Singh in January 1990 formed another committee on electoral reforms headed by the then Law Minister Dinesh Goswami. The committee did laudable and prompt work and submitted its report in May 1990. On the basis of the proposals therein, the government introduced four bills in the Parliament to give effect to its recommendations. But this government also fell before these bills could be enacted.

The Narasimha Rao government convened a special session of the Parliament to get two bills; the Constitution Eighty- Third Amendment Bill 1994 and the Representation of the People Second Amendment Bill, 1994, passed. However, the bills were withdrawn before introduction. The United Front coalition government succeeded in getting the Representation of the People Second Amendment Act enacted in July 1996. The important provisions of the act are as follows:

1) Candidates will not be allowed to contest more than two seats at a time.

2) Elections through a ten-fold increase in the security deposit from Rs. 500 to Rs. 5000.

3) Elections will not be countermanded because of the death of a candidate. In the case of a candidate of a recognised political party, the party will have the authority to nominate a replacement within seven days. No such replacement will be allowed in the case of an independent.

4) The campaign period is reduced from 21 days to 14 days.

The reforms though minimal to begin with can pave the way for more through and comprehensive overhauling of the electoral machinery and process. The following measures can be suggested for electoral reform.

7.6.1 Change in the Electoral System

An electoral system must be truly representative. However, there is a wide gap between the votes polled and seats won in present system where no single party has ever won a majority of votes in any Lok Sabha election but has been able to capture absolute and even two third majority several times. Over the years, the system has come under severe criticism. Opinions have been expressed to change it to a system of proportional representation. L.K. Advani and C.P. Bhambhri advocated proportional representation way back in 1970; the Tarkunde committee recommended a variant of the German system in 1975. Former CECs S.L. Shakdhar and L.P. Singh have argued for a combined system of voting in which 50 per cent of the seats in the Lok Sabha and state assemblies would be filled by direct voting and the remaining on the basis of proportional representation. Tarkunde committee had also suggested combining the present Indian system with a German list system.

7.6.2 Restructuring the Election Commission

One of the basic proposals of those advocating electoral reforms since long had been that of making Election Commission a multi-member body. The Tarkunde and Goswami committees advocated three members EC. Most of the CECs have opposed it on the ground that quick decisions are sometimes required in electoral matters, which may be impeded by multi-member commission. With the 1993 Constitution Amendment Act and the 1995 Supreme Court judgement, multi-member commission has become an accomplished fact. However, the manner in which the ECs are appointed and the provision of majority decision under Art. 324A raise the suspicion that the executive may appoint as many ECs as would constitute a majority and would thus control the commission's decision. A statutory requirement of consulting the Chief Justice of India and the leader of the opposition prior to the appointment of the CEC and ECs can ensure a non-partisan character of the EC. A ban on all post-retirement appointments by the government will

eliminate the tendency and possibility of the CEC and ECs pleasing the government by going out of way.

7.6.3 Eradicating the evil influences of Money and Muscle Power

To check the increasing influence and vulgar show of money, law should fix reasonable ceiling on election expenses and strict compliance of such law should be enforced as was done during T.N. Sheshan's tenure as the CEC. State funding of elections, which has been recommended by all the committees on electoral reforms, should be introduced to curb the menace of money in elections. To prevent growing criminalisation and violence there is an urgent need to implement the EC's proposal of keeping out persons with proven criminal records from electoral context. Model code of conduct should be enforced strictly. Gradually, ways and means must be found to implement the voters' right to recall as well as the right to reject candidates.

The electoral process cannot be cleansed merely by legal measures. The electoral process is influenced and determined by the political culture of the political system, which cannot be reformed by legislative acts. The enlightened citizens who are prepared to uphold political norms and punish those who violates them can be an effective instrument for clean electoral politics. Bolstering the intermediary political and civic institutions, whose collapse has accelerated electoral malpractices, can also be effective in removing the ills of electoral process. However, the strong political will and people's initiative is needed to get rid the electoral of from several defects from which it is suffering.

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

5.   Write a short note on the reforms of electoral politics.

_____

_____

7.7 LET US SUM UP

In this unit, we have discussed the role of election in ensuring people's participation in the political system and strengthening democracy. Election can also weaken democracy, if polls are not free and fair. Therefore, our constitution makers have provided for impartial election machinery, free from executive control to conduct elections for Union and State legislatures and President and Vice-President. Elections in India are an exercise on massive scale involving millions of voters, poll personnel, security men etc.

Caste, community, religion, language, region, etc., are the main determinants of electoral behaviour. However, caste plays the most dominant role in election. Different political parties nominate candidates on the basis of caste composition of the concerned constituency and voters are mobilised on the basis of caste. Even after election caste is given due consideration in ministry formation. Thus, Indian election cannot be understood without properly understanding the role of caste in election.

Elections in India have been marred by the evil influences of money and muscle power. This has led to criminalisation of electoral politics. Earlier criminals used to lend outside support but now they themselves have entered in the electoral arena and have become not only members of the house but even have become ministers. Thus we have a new phenomena in Indian politics 'tainted ministers.' To check the rot, several committees and commissions have been appointed for electoral reforms. These committees have suggested several measures; some of them have been adopted also. But still a lot has to be done to stem the rot. However, law alone cannot clean the electoral system. Vigilant public opinion is also required. People have to be sensitised about the malaise of the electoral process. Only then, free and fair poll can be conducted, which will lead to strengthening of democracy in India.

7.8 KEYWORDS

> ➤ Electoral system: Election is a device through which a modern state creates among its citizens a sense of involvement and participation in public affairs.

> ➤ Election: The electoral roll of a constituency is a list of all those people in that constituency who are registered to vote in the elections.

> ➤ Reforms: The need of electoral reforms was felt quite early in India. The various committees and commissions appointed by the parliament, government and opposition parties have made attempts in this regard.

7.9 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. Discuss the concept of electoral politics.

2. Explain the roll of caste in electoral system.

3. Discuss the two main topics of election system.

4. Highlights the main points of the election roll.

5. Write a short note on the reforms of electoral politics.

7.10 SUGGESTED READINGS AND REFERENCES

1. "Lok Sabha Results 1951-52". Election Commission of India. Retrieved 23 November 2014.

2. "Statistical Report on Lok Sabha Elections 1951-52" (PDF). Election Commission of India. Retrieved 23 November 2014.

3. "EVM-paper trail introduced in 8 of 543 constituencies". *dna*. Retrieved 23 November 2014.

4. Press Trust of India (29 April 2014). "LS polls: Voters to get 'automated-receipts' at Gandhinagar". Business-standard.com. Retrieved 23 November 2014.

5. "ELECTION COMMISSION OF INDIA:Press release" (PDF). Eci.nic.in. Retrieved 23 November 2014.

7.11 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. Election is a device through which a modern state creates among its citizens a sense of involvement and participation in public affairs. A good electoral system is the bedrock of genuine representative government. Much depends on how the system operates in practice, whether competent and honest administrators free from political bias conduct elections efficiently and impartially. The absence of general confidence in the verdict of the ballot may destroy the faith of public in the democratic process. Stressing the importance of electoral process, Pollock observed, "Unless public elections are conducted with accuracy and efficiency, not only the public services are discredited but the whole democratic system is endangered."

India is a constitutional democracy with a parliamentary system of government, and at the heart of the system is a commitment to hold regular, free and fair elections. These elections determine the composition of the government, the membership of the two houses of parliament, the state and union territory legislative assemblies, and the Presidency and Vice- Presidency.

2. **The Role of Caste**

When universal adult suffrage offered all social groups, including previously disenfranchised ones, the right to vote, caste emerged as one of the most significant issues for political mobilization. This, political theorist PratapBhanu Mehta writes in the 2003 book The Burden of Democracy, was in part because caste was "an axis of domination and subordination in Indian society" and the state, by sanctioning categories of caste, provided the incentives to mobilize. But he argues it was also because "there were few other competing

ideologies that allowed people to make sense of their social circumstances in the way caste did."

However, caste politics in the last three decades have been marked by desire for power rather than a substantial agenda for social reform. Parties like BSP and RJD, which came to power by mobilizing lower castes, have failed to offer much in the way of good governance or long-term social transformation. Instead, once some lower-caste groups have gained access to power, they have then sought to confine those privileges to their sub-caste. The problem, though, is not the salience of caste in Indian politics, but the failure to address its underlying causes and create new opportunities for marginalized groups, say some experts. "Unless the newly mobilized Dalit castes can be given access to the gains of the market economy, their prospects for social advancement remain dim," Mehta writes. Analysts note caste plays a lesser role in urban India, and with higher urbanization, its role in electoral politics might decline.

3. Electoral systems are the detailed constitutional arrangements and voting systems that convert the vote into a political decision. The first step is to tally the votes, for which various vote counting systems and ballot types are used. Voting systems then determine the result on the basis of the tally. Most systems can be categorized as either proportional or majoritarian.

Election campaigns

When elections are called, politicians and their supporters attempt to influence policy by competing directly for the votes of constituents in what are called campaigns. Supporters for a campaign can be either formally organized or loosely affiliated, and frequently utilize campaign advertising. It is common for political scientists to attempt to predict elections via Political Forecasting methods.

Difficulties with elections

In many of the countries with weak rule of law, the most common reason why elections do not meet international standards of being "free and fair" is interference from the incumbent government. Dictators may use the

powers of the executive (police, martial law, censorship, physical implementation of the election mechanism, etc.) to remain in power despite popular opinion in favour of removal. Members of a particular faction in a legislature may use the power of the majority or supermajority (passing criminal laws, defining the electoral mechanisms including eligibility and district boundaries) to prevent the balance of power in the body from shifting to a rival faction due to an election.

Non-governmental entities can also interfere with elections, through physical force, verbal intimidation, or fraud, which can result in improper casting or counting of votes. Monitoring for and minimizing electoral fraud is also an ongoing task in countries with strong traditions of free and fair elections. Problems that prevent an election from being "free and fair" take various forms.

3. The electoral roll of a constituency is a list of all those people in that constituency who are registered to vote in the elections. Only those people whose names are there in the electoral rolls are allowed to vote as 'electors'.

Main points of the electoral roll are mentioned below:

COMPUTERISATION OF ROLLS

ELECTORS' PHOTO IDENTITY CARDS

SCHEDULING OF ELECTION

DEPLOYMENT OF POLLING PERSONNEL

NOMINATION & CAMPAIGN

5. The need of electoral reforms was felt quite early in India. The various committees and commissions appointed by the parliament, government and opposition parties have made attempts in this regard. First such major effort for electoral reforms was made in 1971, when a Joint Parliamentary Committee on Amendments to Election Law was appointed under the chairmanship of Jagannath Rao, which submitted its report in 1972.

Change in the Electoral System

An electoral system must be truly representative. However, there is a wide gap between the votes polled and seats won in present system where no single party has ever won a majority of votes in any Lok Sabha election but has been able to capture absolute and even two third majority several times. Over the years, the system has come under severe criticism. Opinions have been expressed to change it to a system of proportional representation. L.K. Advani and C.P. Bhambhri advocated proportional representation way back in 1970; the Tarkunde committee recommended a variant of the German system in 1975. Former CECs S.L. Shakdhar and L.P. Singh have argued for a combined system of voting in which 50 per cent of the seats in the Lok Sabha and state assemblies would be filled by direct voting and the remaining on the basis of proportional representation.

Restructuring the Election Commission

One of the basic proposals of those advocating electoral reforms since long had been that of making Election Commission a multi-member body. The Tarkunde and Goswami committees advocated three members EC. Most of the CECs have opposed it on the ground that quick decisions are sometimes required in electoral matters, which may be impeded by multi-member commission.

Eradicating the evil influences of Money and Muscle Power

To check the increasing influence and vulgar show of money, law should fix reasonable ceiling on election expenses and strict compliance of such law should be enforced as was done during T.N. Sheshan's tenure as the CEC. State funding of elections, which has been recommended by all the committees on electoral reforms, should be introduced to curb the menace of money in elections. To prevent growing criminalisation and violence there is an urgent need to implement the EC's proposal of keeping out persons with proven criminal records from electoral context. Model code of conduct should be enforced strictly. Gradually, ways and means must be found to implement the voters' right to recall as well as the right to reject candidates.