India's Coalitions and Political Stability

Dr. Hanumanthappa D. G

Assistant Professor, Dept. of Studies and Research in Political Science, Rani Channamma University, Vidy Sangama, Belagavi-591156, Karnataka-India

*Corresponding Author: *Dr. Hanumanthappa D. G, Assistant Professor, Dept. of Studies and Research in Political Science, Rani Channamma University, Vidy Sangama, Belagavi-591156, Karnataka-India.*

Abstract: *As a great triumph, India chose democracy and has been operating a robust democratic system for almost 70 years. In India, the study of coalitions is still in its infancy. It may, however, turn out to be quite important for our country. These alliances are an essential step in democracy's formation. They might be a logical stage in India's transition from a multiparty system to a bi-party one, a country with over a hundred political parties.*

Keywords: *Democracy, Coalitions, alliances, Political parties, multiparty system.*

1. INTRODUCTION

It is customary to believe that coalition governance in India is a relatively new aspect of the Indian system and, as a result, would be a transitory phase. Given the current state of national politics, such viewpoints may have little empirical basis, with no single party securing a clear majority in the Lok Sabha since 1984, and the number of parties sharing power expanding by leaps and bounds from 12 (1996) to 18 (1998) to 24 (2001). (1999). However, even in recent years, the two major parties have behaved differently. The Congress has continuously refused to even discuss sharing power in New Delhi, stating plainly that it intends to eventually rule as a single party. For a decade, beginning in 1996, the Bharatiya Janata Party pursued a similar agenda, polarising voters along ideological lines in the hope of dethroning the Congress as the natural party of administration. However, the formation of solid coalitions at the federal level is still in its early stages. State-level experiences are insufficient as the longest-lasting regimes (like in West Bengal or Maharashtra) have seen parties with comparable socioeconomic bases and ideological perspectives share power. This has yet to happen in New Delhi. Before delving into the prospects for future alliances, it is important to take a step back and consider how we arrived at this fork in the road.

2. KINDS OF COALITIONS GOVERNMENTS

Various forms of coalitions have existed in political systems across the world over the ages. The most important of them are those who have enlisted.

2.1. Communal Coalition

As a result of the communal uproar caused by the BJP and its alliance's demolition of the Babri Masjid in Ayodhya, a coalition government in Maharashtra was formed, consisting of the BJP-Shiv Sena and rebel Congressmen who won elections and supported the BJP-Shiv Sena combination after the elections. Despite the fact that the secular forces in Maharashtra received a bigger proportion of votes than the BJP-Shiv Sena alliance, the dissident Congressmen enabled the establishment of the BJP-Shiv Sena coalition in Maharashtra.

2.2. Secular Coalition

Secular-based political parties like as the CPI, CPI (M), Congress, RJD, SP, BSP, and others have come forth with secular views to create the secular bloc.

2.3. Positive Coalition

This is also characterised as a positive alliance since it is constructive and created with the goal of bringing down the ruling political party as well as creating an alternative government.

2.4. Negative Coalition

This is when the parties join forces solely to bring down the government that is currently in office. It does not bear the responsibility of creating a new government. It doesn't provide a better option. Such a combination might thus be either damaging or negative.

2.5. An Express Coalition

It denotes a lawful and authorised alliance. It is a legal alliance with a certain organisation with a clear knowledge of the give and take. The sharing of power in an explicit coalition is genuine, significant, and authentic.

2.6. Tacit Coalition

It signifies implicit, internal secret. In this sense, a tacit coalition is just an understanding with a group without really joining it. The sharing of power in this arrangement is minimal.

By 1947, it was evident that the Congress would take over most, if not all, of India's authority from the British. One of its historical assets was its capacity to reinvent itself and absorb new currents of thought and major blocs of the public. It had major friends in two Muslim-dominated territories, the North West Frontier Province and the princely state of Kashmir, even in 1946. From 1946 onwards, it has also shared power in an uneasy alliance with the Muslim League. However, the Congress's programmatic commitment to a strong Centre with residuary powers was a key stumbling block in negotiations. This was an important component of the Nehru Report of 1928, which also advocated for universal suffrage.

Despite several adjustments, these ideals were to be realised in the new post-1947 political system, particularly with the adoption of the 1950 Constitution. A third, frequently neglected component was the pledge made in the Poona Pact of 1931 to reserve seats in the assembly for historically disadvantaged groups, the Scheduled Castes and Tribes. BR Ambedkar, unlike the Muslim League, abandoned the idea for a distinct electorate. Seats were allocated for voters who voted as a cohesive body. Such measures enabled the Congress to quickly regain support among Dalit voters, who remained loyal to it for decades. Similar success was achieved among minority voters as a result of the emphasis on pluralism. The Congress, which was always more of an umbrella party than a strict or doctrinal organisation, was crucial in providing India with a measure of political stability in the early post-independence years. In reality, many of its adversaries were able to enter under the Nehru regime. Despite having a majority, the early Nehru government included well-known adversaries of his party such as Ambedkar, SP Mukherjee, and professionals such as Dr John Mathai and CD Deshmukh. The enlargement of the franchise to all adults in 1952 was quickly followed by the cession of the demand for linguistic reorganisation of states. The Congress was able to give in to such requests without jeopardising its own electoral base. The extension of the franchise relied on decades of social reform efforts in most of southern and western India. New leaders climbed to power, such as Kamaraj in Tamil Nadu and YB Chavan in Maharashtra, but accorded public ambitions their proper position in government.

The incorporation of the Backward Classes or rural masses into the power structure occurred without great social upheaval. For many years, the Congress was both a power party and the appropriate venue for people who disagreed with the government's policies. As a result, contrasting opinions were aired in party forums: for and against additional agricultural resources, for and against reservation, for and against government influence over the party. The structure has flaws, which can only be mentioned because they are important to the future of Indian democracy. The party frequently considered itself as the caretaker of the nation, and it attempted to utilise Article 356 to dismiss state governments, most notably against the Communist ministry in Kerala. Furthermore, the party quickly became a branch of the state machinery, a trend that peaked during the Indira period (1966-77; 1980-84). The opposition reacted by creating broad coalitions in order to pool their votes. The ruling party was deposed in seven states in 1967, and it divided two years later.

It is no accident that some of the parties that had banded together against it at the state level joined together in 1977 to create the first non-Congress rule in New Delhi. In reality, understanding the pulls and strains of Indian politics now requires tracing their origins back to the post-1967 upheavals. It was simpler to depose Congress than to create a new political instrument of authority.

The dissolution of the unified Opposition administrations in much of north India was caused by a difference of interest and philosophy between the Jana Sangh and the socialists. The former had a stronger urban character, while the latter had a rural background; the former was stronger among the top strata, while the latter was stronger among the lower and middle strata.

Similar schisms led to the demise of Morarji Desai's (1977-79) cabinet. A second key element was the removal of the Congress from authority in certain states. This happened first in Tamil Nadu, when a regional party obtained power, and then in West Bengal in 1977, when a Marxist-led coalition assumed power. A process of gradual displacement of Congress from the position as the natural party of government was at work throughout time. Following the 1979 collapse, opposition groups abandoned attempts to combine because to internal schisms. However, rifts on issues and confrontations at the grassroots surfaced under VP Singh's next non-Congress government (1989-90).

This time, though, the ideological divide was more pronounced. Reservation of seats in Union government offices for the Other Backward Classes, long a fixture in southern and western India, stirred forth considerable hostile responses among the higher castes notably in the Hindi belt. The statement in August was followed by BJP leader LK Advani's October campaign to a disputed site in Ayodhya. Though neither the Mandal nor the Mandir cards succeeded in the traditional sense, in that they did not provide the individuals who played them with a key to retain or gain power, they left an indelible effect on Indian politics.

In reality, the Congress was pushed to the sidelines after failing to secure a majority in the 1991 elections. Both caste and community would now play a more explicit role in political mobilisation than in the past, trapping the old consensus party between two stools. It established a watered-down version of the OBC reservations, but its inability to safeguard the Babri Masjid harmed its reputation and ultimately stopped it from mounting a claim to power in 1996. The pursuit of a dominant partner the reign of VP Singh in 1989 was the first of a new generation of Indian governments. It was not the first coalition, but it lacked a powerful party at the heart of it. The Janata Dal soon divided, despite the fact that all parties took up the Janata Dal's platform of Backward Class assertion in different ways. The Congress government of PV Narasimha Rao (1991-96) lasted five years, instituting important economic changes, although the party had obviously peaked. The splits in north India among huge sections of voters along community and caste lines resulted in India having a government that lacked a majority in Uttar Pradesh for the first time. The regional parties dominated the United Front administrations, with a 58-member bloc (1996-98).

Only by acknowledging this new aspect of Indian politics, namely the influence of regional actors at the Union level, could any combination aspire to office. On two points, the consecutive Vajpayee governments of 1998 and 1999 are therefore based on a shared programme. The first is to abstain from the BJP's older political platform while in government, which calls for limiting the fundamental impulses of various front organisations of its fraternal organisations. It remains to be seen if it will entail a fundamental change of heart. Ideological Hindutva contradicts the necessity for broad-based support for the parties in power: the issue has been avoided for the time being. The second is to delegate a crucial role to partners who frequently have a presence in only one or a few states. It is unclear if the adjustments are only cosmetic or will have a greater impact in the future. Regardless of subjective impressions, there are two crucial factors in such a configuration. One strategy is to force an ideologically linked party to abandon radical policies in order to maintain power. The second is to press the question of the structure of Union-state relations, which is changing dramatically. Much depends on the capacity of the ruling coalition to solve these difficulties. At the core of the ruling National Democratic Alliance lies an ongoing power battle. The BJP, as the largest party, aspires to rule, but has so far been unable to accomplish so.

3. COALITION'S STABILITY

Coalitions form as a result of a political need, yet various participants may have mutually contradictory objectives. There are significant differences in the interests of smaller and larger parties. The BJP would aim to a position of control similar to that held by the leading party in Kerala's mixed governments, whether the Congress or the CPI (M). Tiny groups, like as the Telugu Desam, would prefer a United Front-style setup in which smaller parties hold the key to power and may wield more influence than their numbers suggest. However, there is another schism at the centre of the party

system. Both the Congress and the BJP would want a stronger Centre. The former was its primary architect, while the latter is now its primary ideologue. However, this appears to be a challenging line to maintain in the future years.

There are a variety of variables at work that are eroding the Union's capacity to meddle in state-level politics and economics. One has been the erosion of the government's influence in economic issues since the beginning of market-led reforms in the 1990s. State governments can now rise funding directly from private investors and foreign organisations. Even the suggestions of the Eleventh Finance Commission had to be rewritten to reflect the perspectives of the economically more advanced countries. Even the Union's role in balancing regional inequities is under threat. As inequities deepen and broaden, such pressures are going to increase. Several estimates suggest that almost three fourths of all fresh investment over the previous decade has migrated to a handful of states in the west and south. Fiscal federalism is certain to become a prominent pillar, with poorer states requesting a greater slice of the pie and others objecting. State governments' soaring wage expenses have exacerbated such issues, resulting in all of them requesting more resources. It is not frequently realised that states in India perform the majority of welfare duties and continue to play an important role in infrastructure development. However, they only get around 40% of total income. Previously, this was commonly seen as critical to ensuring overall development. There will undoubtedly be calls for additional economic decentralisation in the coming years. This is in addition to mutually conflicting requests for resource transfers from and to various sorts of nations. Given the degree of centralisation, it may be able to purchase time by reneging on certain major devolution requests. However, this may have to wait for a coalition or administration that looks considerably different from the ones we've seen so far.

The political dimension of federalism is the second dimension. Many, but not all, states have more political stability than New Delhi. Chief ministers such as Chandra Babu Naidu (1995-) of Andhra Pradesh and Digvijay Singh (1993-) of Punjab may not have ruled for as long as Jyoti Basu of West Bengal (1977-2000). They have, however, outlasted several incumbents in New Delhi. At a structural level, the employment of Article 356 has become increasingly difficult as a result of a number of circumstances, all of which have decreased the opportunity for its misuse by the ruling regime at the Centre. However, there is a huge disparity in how issues are seen within and outside of the Hindi belt. In the former, a strong centre is regarded as essential. In the latter, it is interpreted as an indication of an oppressive and distant power. Until recently, an all-India party could hide such flaws. This is no longer true. In the consecutive general elections held during the 1990s, the two largest parties never received more than about half of the popular vote. This will necessitate the development of cross-party negotiation as a more developed mechanism of dispute resolution than has previously been the case.

The third component of the changes that are taking place is demographic, which is intimately linked to economic and political developments. If current projections are correct, peninsular and coastal India will have had zero population increase. In much of southern India, this is already the case, with Kerala (1988) and Tamil Nadu (1993) leading the way. The north, on the other hand, is in a completely different scenario, with population growth predicted to slow to a net replacement ratio only between 2050 and 2100. This has already caused in a decision to lock the ratio of seas in the Lok Sabha at the level of the 1971 census. Changes were met with resistance. The states with less people contended that they would be penalised for having fewer children. The more populous areas believed they had a claim to representation based on population. As a result, the decision was postponed until 2025, when the current structure will be reconsidered.

The coming quarter century will be one of extraordinary transformation in economic, political, and demographic aspects. Political stability is not impossible to achieve in the limited sense. The peaceful transition of power through the ballot box, as well as the historically underprivileged parts' increased turnout at election time, are now permanent characteristics of the Indian landscape. Political upheavals in India have resulted in the country's first two south Indian Prime Ministers and a Dalit woman chief premier. Separatism in states such as Tamil Nadu and Mizoram has given way to progressive integration without jeopardising the region's cultural identity. Despite repeated changes of guard in the South Block, economic reforms have proceeded apace. All of this points to the maturation of democratic institutions. There are times of uncertainty and unwholesome behaviour, but

the system overall is stronger. However, fresh problems wait. While their precise nature is unknown, the contours can be drawn out.

5. CONCLUSION

In recent years, there have been numerous supporters of strong two-party or two-front systems. They have grown in strength as a result of no party being able to achieve a clear majority since 1984, and no multi-party coalition being able to serve a complete term in power. These arguments, whose validity cannot be properly addressed here, will not result in a fundamental breakthrough for a variety of reasons. This is because of four independent yet interconnected factors. One is political: there is still no one powerful national political organisation that can compete with the Congress of the pre-1967 era. Even the Congress and the BJP have failed to reach an agreement on fundamental topics such as a constitutional review. Second, despite agreement on specific political topics such as deposing the National Front government in 1990 or the United Front Government in 1997, there is still a wide difference between the two principal parties' socioeconomic bases. Throughout the 1990s, a slew of trustworthy polls suggested that the Congress is weaker among people at the lowest end of the social and economic spectrum, and weaker as the social group's educational, social standing, and economic well-being increased.

The opposite is true for the BJP. This indicates that the former will be slightly left of centre, while the latter will be more pronouncedly pro-market. Third, there are far too many lesser actors who have grown 11 in clout and would vigorously oppose any attempts to curb their authority. This comprises major regional parties that formed and deconstructed administrations throughout the 1990s. All indications are that a grouping of 50-60 Lok Sabha MPs has become as crucial even for a party to come to power in New Delhi. Fourth, and most importantly, the ideological support base for a two-party system is highest among social groups with the lowest degree of political engagement. The voting statistics for the middle class are abysmally low, while those for deprived groups are disproportionately high. The latter frequently believe that modern politics has given them greater bargaining power than the previous system of one-party control. This is a strong point of view expressed by leaders of the Bahujan Samaj Party, who go so far as to say that instability is necessary for their supporters. It is not necessary to agree with their radical beliefs to recognise that they reflect the opinions of substantial groupings of players.

REFERENCES

Naresh Chandra Sahni (Ed.), "Coalition Politics in India," Jullundur: New Academy Publishing Co., 1971.

K. P. Karunakaran, "Coalition Governments in India - Problems and Prospects," Indian Institute of Advanced Study, Simla, 1975.

Sukadev Nanda, "Coalitional Politics in Orissa," Sterling Publications Pvt Ltd, New Delhi, 1979.

C. Subhash Kashyap (Ed.), Uppal Publishing House, New Delhi, 1997, "Coalition Government and Politics in India."

Prakash Chander (Ed.), "Coalition Politics in India," kmo Publications, New Delhi, 2000.

Riker, William H., "The Theory of Political Coalitions," Oxford University Press and IBH Publishing Company, New Delhi, 1970.

Paranjay Guha Thakurta and Shankar Raguraman, "A Time of Coalitions - Divided We Stand," SAGE Publication, New Delhi, 2000. D. Ramsundar (Ed.),

National Publishing House, New Delhi, 2000, "Coalition Politics in India: The Search for Political Stability."

S. R. Maheshwari, "Coalition Government - 1976 Indian Experience: 1946-1996," "Politics in India," New Delhi, July 1996, p.23.

S. K. Sachadeva (Ed.), "From Gowda to Gujral and After/"Competition Success Review," New Delhi, June 1997, pp.67-73.