



---

## **Origin and evolution of political parties in india**

Dr Shriparkash, Associate Professor, Department of Political Science,

Mukand Lal National College Yamuna Nagar

*Email id- dr.majorshri1969@gmail.com*

### **Abstract**

Indian politics and history may be traced back to the independence movement against British colonial rule, the gradual expansion of voting rights beginning in the early 20th century, and the inclusion of universal voting rights for adults under India's Constitution since 1950. If the spread of democracy is the most important explanatory variable for the existing party system, then the parliamentary-federal Constitution under which India's democracy has operated for the last seven decades, as well as the regional and multicultural diversity of India's population, are the intermediate or mediating variables responsible for shaping its patterns and trends. So, the patterns and tendencies that have developed over the years inside the Indian party system have served as a filter through which the primary effects of democratic mobilization have been channeled. India's political past, cultural diversity, and Constitution all contribute to how democratic mobilization has shaped the country's party structure. The development of political parties in India is the focus of this study.

**Keywords:** Origin, Evolution, Political Parties, Elections, India.

### **Introduction**

We're still in the midst of party formation. Cemeteries of the past are often dominated by political parties. A "Prickley" in Athens or "Gracchi" in Rome might be the first course of the feast. Its expansion, however, was helped along by factors including an unrepresentative political structure and a lack of citizenship options. Democratic politics is also necessary for political parties. Clubs serve as a constant connection between universal suffrage and legislative power, It ultimately resulted in the establishment of legislative coalitions and election committees (Ajay, 2003). The expansion of political parties is affected by parliamentary democracies and regular elections. According to political scientist Ernest Barker, the British system is the progenitor of all parliamentary democracies since it



established the first political parties. Barker claims that the Royalists and Parliamentarians battled each other throughout the Civil War for the rights and powers of the king's parliament. During the 1830s, these two factions merged to become the Conservative and Liberal Parties (Joseph, 1972). They serve as a template for the two-party system in modern Britain. In the wake of electoral shifts in 1832, 1867, and 1884, new British political parties emerged. Due to increased transparency, once-dominant aristocratic elites have been deposed and ordinary individuals are increasingly taking part in government.

### **Types of Party System**

Popular political structures include those with only one, two, or more parties:

For an extended period of time, one political party has been successful at the national level, winning elections and creating successive national administrations.

A two-party system has two major parties competing for control. In this setup, one political party serves as the country's government while the other is in the opposition. This is the standard practice in the United States and the United Kingdom.

Contrarily, under a system with many parties, no one group has sway over government at the national level. Each of these organizations is capable, either alone or in conjunction with others, of forming national administrations and winning national elections. Countries with well-known multi-party systems include Germany, France, and Canada (Myron, 1962).

### **Research Methodology**

The study uses secondary sources. The work uses political party, government, and Election Commission of India materials and reliable sources. Books, journals, newspapers, magazines, and the internet provide resources for studying the issue.

### **Results**

#### **The Development and Change of India's Political Parties**

##### **One Party Dominant System (1952-67):**



Colonialism was the single most important impact in determining how most Asian countries are governed, how laws are enforced, and how social services are delivered. Rashiduddin Khan and his fellow nationalists may find common ground on issues such as national unity and integration, national defense and security, and "regional socio-cultural variety" supplied by the objective condition of the growth of regional parties and groups. According to the National Commission on how different viewpoints are accommodated in Indian politics, Khan argues that "the cohabitation of left, center, and right forces in the battle for freedom has created the framework for tolerance and the connection to election and reform prospects."

The elections of 1967 was a watershed moment in Indian politics, coming after a period of significant structural changes to the political system. The percentage of the electorate voting for Congress went down from 44.7% to 40%. The election result was devastating to members of Congress. A fractured, factionalized, and shapeless party headed by a woman who is still in disbelief at Nehru's death and the complexities of two states (Indira Gandhi). She was completely destroyed in the polls, and many party leaders were not happy about it.

### **Polarization of Regional Political Parties (1967-77):**

Indian politics reached a tipping point with the 1967 elections, which took place following a period of significant reform that strengthened the country's institutional framework. Out of a total of sixteen states, the Congress party lost the majority in the state assembly in eight of them. Vote share in Congress dropped from 44.7% to 40.8%. The election results broke Congress's dominance. The party was in disarray following Nehru's passing and two successions, with the current leader being a woman (Indira Gandhi). Her disapproval ratings were low, and voters punished her at the polls after hearing complaints from party insiders.

Riots broke out in the states of Maharashtra, Assam, and Bengal in 1969 and 1970. An government that isn't strong will lead to anarchy, as Indira Gandhi warned. Indira Gandhi faced up against non-Congress state governments and national opposition parties. In the party and the government, she instituted a "pyramidal decision-making structure." Indira Gandhi overthrew the governments of Andhra Pradesh, Rajasthan, Assam, and Madhya Pradesh with the support of the military. To resolve party difficulties, she ceased going via Congress High Command and started communicating directly with them. According to Jayaprakash Narayan, "Indira is India and India is Indira." A "one-party dominant system to one-party

---



autocratic government" was on the horizon for India. Parliamentary and state legislature elections were separated from one another and Congress Party organizational elections were put on hold from 1971 and 1992.

### **Evolution of Bi- Party Situation: Mergers and Splits (1977-79):**

When the Congress Party was finally defeated in the general election held in March 1977, it marked the end of thirty years of dominance by the party, eleven years of rule by Indira Gandhi, and twenty-one months of emergency that led to authoritarianism. Student-founded and rapidly spreading opposition organisations and movements like Gujarat's Nava Nirman Yuval Samiti and Bihar's Chhatra Sangharsh Samiti, for example were a direct result of Indira Gandhi's highly centralized administration. There was an upsurge in public strikes, especially in the manufacturing and transportation sectors.

When the Congress Party lost the election in 1978, it split into two camps: Indira Gandhi's Congress (I) and Swaran Singh and Dev Raj Urs' Congress (C) (II). Janata Party leaders Morarji Desai, Jagjivan Ram, and Charan Singh had different agendas, reflecting the administration's inability to find common ground. In the middle of 1979, the Janata Party administration fell apart. The party structure was less stable and there was more open competition between political parties. Changes in control of Congress and state legislatures brought about a continuous decrease. A flexible factional and rump party structure may emerge when a party is fragmented owing to changes in party leadership or a wide range of interests. After the seventh Lok Sabha election in 1980, Congress I gained a 351-2/3 majority in the lower chamber and took control of the government. The Janata Party and the Lok Dal both received a portion of the vote.<sup>67</sup> As early as 1978 and 1979, discord between Morarji Desai, Charan Singh, and Jagjivan Ram caused the Janata Party to begin to fall apart. The central government and party split into the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), the Lok Dal, and the Janata Dal.

The "regionalization of politics" is a concern for the national Congress Party. a regionalization of national parties. Jammu and Kashmir's National Conference, Bengal's and Tripura's Communist Party of India (Marxist), Andhra Pradesh's Telugu Desam Party (TDP), and Karnataka's Janata Dal were all regional parties in state administrations in 1983. Just four states went to Congress (1), while they only had a plurality in four others and suffered

---



lopsided defeats in the legislatures of three other states. The party had a loss of 26.79 percent of its seats but a gain in assembly districts.<sup>83</sup> During the elections for the Punjab Vidhan Sabha in September 1985 and the Assam State Assembly in December 1985, the Shiromani Akali Dal (L) and the Asom Gana Parishad (AGP) respectively defeated the INC.

### **Restoration of Congress Party's Dominance (1980-89):**

In conclusion, under Indira Gandhi and her son Rajiv, Congress (I) scored resounding victory in 1980 and 1984 and subsequent state assembly, developing charismatic leadership. Success for a party during this time period hinged on a single person functioning as a national hegemon, with non-Congress or anti-Congress parties often failing to gain traction on a national scale. When it came to politics, Indira Gandhi was a sexist. As far as she was concerned, Nehru's fortune should have gone to her children (Indian political system). She did not like national or state Congress leaders who could count on popular backing from outside groups. Congress Party internal democracy weakened over time as elections were suspended, ticket allotment was strictly regulated, party finances were centrally managed, and chief ministers were chosen by the federal government. Rajiv Gandhi was not successful in maintaining these trends or revitalizing party structures.

### **A National Multi-Party System Erupts, and the House of Representatives Loses Its Monopoly (1989-96):**

Indian politics went from being dominated by a single party to having many competing factions after the legislative elections of 1989. There were three minority administrations in the nation, each led by a different political party: V.P. Singh's National Front, Chandra Shekhar's Samajwadi Janata Dal, and P.V. Narasimha Rao's Congress Party. Due to the fact that the Lok Sabha, Rajya Sabha, and Vidhan Sabhas each have their own set of powerful parties, the country's highest echelons of governance have grown more decentralized and federalized. There was no one political party that was able to win a majority of the 263 seats in the Lower House at the 1989 parliamentary elections. A "hung Parliament" was disbanded. Despite losing the majority, the Congress Party has gained the most seats (197) and the highest share of the vote (39.5%) in the House of People. When the votes were counted, Sudha Pai's NF took home 143 seats, or 17.8 percent of the total. While the BJP rose from two to eighty-eight Lok Sabha seats, placing it third after the Congress and the Janata Dal, the



NF's partners did not do as well as projected. The TDP gained two seats, the Congress (S) received one, and the DMK received none.

The liberalization, privatization, and globalization policies of P.V. Narasimha Rao led to a devaluation of the rupee, a reduction in public expenditure, the privatization of state-owned companies, and a decrease in government subsidies (LPG). Tensions arose inside and across parties as a result of the new budgetary measures. P.V. Narasimha Rao ministers Buta Singh, Balram Jakhar, Madhava Rao Scindia, Arjun Singh, K. Natwar Singh, and N.D. Tiwari were all complicit in Hawala fraud and JMM bribes. These events hurt the credibility of the Congress Party. While N.D. Tiwari and Arjun Singh left the Congress Party to form Congress Tiwari, G.K. Moopanar created the Tamil Manila Congress in opposition to Narasimha Rao's chanakya approach. After Rajiv Gandhi's death, the INC had its worst decline in electoral and organizational support since 1977. In both Uttar Pradesh and Tamil Nadu, the party finished in third place.

### **Loose Bi-Polar Alliance System (1998 to the Present):**

Since 1998, India's political system has had a "loose bi-polar coalition framework." No single party can form a national government in a multi-party system, hence governments must instead be formed via coalitions. It is unusual for two national coalitions to form at the same time, but that is exactly what has happened with the National Democratic Alliance, headed by the BJP, and the United Progressive Alliance, led by the Congress. India's party system is marked by a bi-polar alliance structure rather than a proliferation of smaller parties or widespread fragmentation of the political landscape. As the last stage is still multi-party, another name for it is "multi-party loose bipolar alliance system."

According to Zoya Hasan, "a nationwide two-party system has not emerged because to India's socioeconomic diversity and the first-past-the-post election method." As a result of their dominance in national elections in 1998 and 1999, regional parties converged around the BJP and the Congress to establish two blocs, one on the right and one in the center. Political groups including the TDP, DMK, BSP, SP, and the Left have sway in many different states.

In the 2009 Lok Sabha election, the UPA and NDA faced off. Eight parties were members of the NDA headed by the BJP, whereas eleven were part of the UPA led by the Congress. The

---



Congress-UPA coalition received 262 seats after the election (or 48.0% of the vote share), falling short by 10. The BJP and its allies got 159 seats. In Dr. Manmohan Singh's UPA government, the SP, BSP, RJD, JD(S), and various Independents all showed their support. Singh was in power for a total of five years.

## **Conclusion**

The expansion of political parties is affected by parliamentary democracies and regular elections. According to political scientist Ernest Barker, the British system is the progenitor of all parliamentary democracies since it established the first political parties. The national party system became a flexible three- or four-coalition structure after the elections in 1989 and 1991, with parties creating alliances or fronts with regional and other small parties to increase their position and coordinate their policies and actions in Parliament. The Congress Party, which was in the lead of the largest alliance after the by-election in November 1991, raised their tally of members in the legislature from 227 to 251 with the aid of the AIADMK and four other minor parties. A total of 123 votes were cast, with the majority going to the BJP-Shiv Sena alliance. The National Front, led by the Janata Dal, gained 140 seats in the House as a third alliance.

## **References**

1. Ajay K. Mehra, "Historical Development of Party Systems in India", in Ajay K. Mehra, D.D. Khanna and Gert W. Kueck (eds.), *Political Parties and Party Systems*, New Delhi: Sage Publications, 2003, p.50.
2. Joseph La Palmobara and Myron Weiner, "The Origin and Development of Political Parties", in J.L. Palmobara and Myron Weiner (eds.), *Political Parties and Political Development*, Princeton: Princeton University, 1972, p.7.
3. Kothari, Rajni. (1989). *Politics and the People: In Search of a humane India Volume-I*. New Delhi, Ajanta Publications.
4. Manor, James (1988) 'Parties and the Party System' first published in Atul Kohli (ed.): *India's Democracy: Changing State-Society Relations*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
5. Maurice Duverger, *Political Parties: Their Organization and Activity in Modern State*, (translated by Barbara and Robert North), London: Methuen and Co. 1967, p. XXIV.



6. Myron Weiner, Party Politics in India: The Development of a Multi-Party System, New Jersey: Princeton University, 1962, p.16.
7. Sudha Pai, “From One-Party Dominance to Multi-Partyism: Regionalising Trends in the Development of the Indian Multi-Party System”, in S. Bhatnagar and Pradeep Kumar (eds.), Some Issues in Contemporary Indian Politics, New Delhi: ESS Publications, 1997, p.155.
8. The BJP allies (2004) were: TDP, AIADMK, JD(U), Shiv Sena, All India Trinamool Congress, Shriromani Akali Dal, BJD, Nagaland People’s Front, MNF.
9. The UPA (2009) was made up of the Indian National Congress, All India Trinamool Congress, DMK, NCP, National Conference, Jharkhand Mukti Morcha, Indian Union Muslim League, Viduthalai Chiruthaigal Katchi, Kerala Congress (Mani), All India Majlis-e-Ittehadul Muslimeen, Republican Party of India (Athvale).
10. Weiner, Myron. (1978). India at the Polls: The Parliamentary Elections of 1977. Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute.