



Review Paper

History of Haryana's Coalition Politics: A Study

Dinesh Kumar^{1*}

¹Research Scholar, Department of Political Science, Kumaun University Nainital Uttarakhand, India

Corresponding Author: *Dinesh Kumar

Abstract	Manuscript Information
<p>In a democracy, political parties are unavoidable. They have never been absent from a free, large nation. They bind the legislative and executive branches to the sovereign people. They are the most important institutions in a democracy. In fact, the nature of the political parties that run every system of representative government determines how well it functions. Cultural diversity, socioeconomic, ethnic, caste, communal, and religious heterogeneity, nationalist movement traditions, and competing ideological viewpoints have all had a significant impact on political parties and the party system in India. The Indian Constitution's drafters wanted a multi-party parliamentary system because they were cognizant of the pluralistic makeup of Indian culture. As a result, academics like Rajni Kothari and Morris Jones described the post-independence era's party system as one-party rule. As per Rajni Kothari, "One party domination is a good way to describe the Indian system, which should be highlighted differs greatly from what is typically thought of as a one-party system. Although it is a competitive party system, the contending elements perform roles that are somewhat different from one another." Although the Indian Republic has always had a multi-party system, it only started to become noticeable at the state level in 1967 and at the federal level in 1989. Its national appearance since 1989 has accelerated and reinforced the Indian polity's federal structure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ISSN No: 2583-7397 ▪ Received: 12-06-2024 ▪ Accepted: 11-07-2024 ▪ Published: 26-07-2024 ▪ IJCRM:3(4); 2024: 77-80 ▪ ©2024, All Rights Reserved ▪ Plagiarism Checked: Yes ▪ Peer Review Process: Yes
	<p>How to Cite this Manuscript</p> <p>Dinesh Kumar. History of Haryana's Coalition Politics: A Study. International Journal of Contemporary Research in Multidisciplinary.2024; 3(4): 77-80.</p>

KEYWORDS: Coalition Politics, democracy, Coalescere, Vishal Haryana Party, BKU protestors.

INTRODUCTION

A coalition is defined as "a cooperative arrangement under which different political parties and members of such parties unite to create a government or ministry" in the Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences by Professor A. Ogg. The failure of a single party to control the majority in the legislature leads to the formation of a coalition government. To dominate the majority, a number of political parties or groupings must work together. The coalition or these political parties. The Latin word "Coalitio," which is the verbal substantive of "Coalescere"—to join together—and "alescere"—to grow up, which means to grow or together—has been used to denote the phrase coalition. A coalition is a temporary alliance or union of political groups with the goal of forming a single political government. As a result of the demands

of a multi-party system in a democratic democracy, such coalitions are the natural offspring. Single-party regimes, in which only one party establishes government, are sometimes contrasted with coalition administrations.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

According to the current study, coalition politics are firmly entrenched in the federal systems of India. A closer examination reveals that it is a reflection of a social transformation in which a greater number of formerly dormant groups in Indian society are becoming politically active. Again, a number of aspects in the scenario need to be looked at. This study concentrated on the following in this regard:

1. To research India's history of coalition government;
2. To analyses the various social engineering aspects that are crucial for coalition;
3. To describe the coalition faces in the Haryana state;
4. How and why coalition became important in making decisions.

Coalition Politics in India

Between 1947 and 1967, Indian politics were coalitional in style. This was on a political party or political formation level. A theoretical model for this level was devised in the late 1960s by functionalist political scientists including Rajni Kotliari, Morris-Jones, and Myron Weier using the concept of a one-party dominion system or Congress system. Congress's dominance was demonstrated by the number of seats it possessed in the national parliament, the number of state governments it established, and its impressive organizational capacity outside of the legislative branches. Therefore, in the first three general elections, Congress received about 45% of the total vote and 75% of the parliamentary seats. With minor exceptions, the Congress maintained its control over the majority of the states and the federal government.

Morris Jones claimed that the Congress system demonstrated "dominance coexisting with competition but without a sign of alteration." Other parties were relegated to the margins by Congress's colossal political domination. As a result, the traditional textbook model of government and opposition could not be used to understand the Indian political system at this time. At both the State and federal levels, it was the powerful Congress vs weak, dispersed opposition forces. Maurice Duverger's law, which anticipated the emergence of a two-party system in a plurality electoral system by incorporating political competition and consociational arrangements within its boundaries and holding it together through a careful handling of factions, was successfully defined by Congress. When the Congress leadership met with the prime minister of India, it was clear that the centre would frequently "move a decision from the party's internal space to the external space. If they were confident in their ability to prevail, of the political system as a whole coalition'. According to Max Zins' study of Congress, this is how crises in Congress were resolved.

The Political Background of Haryana

In 1966, Haryana was separated from Punjab. The people of Haryana felt that the Sikh community controlled their culture and politics prior to its creation. This region had poor infrastructure and Industrial sector was not evolved to satisfactory level. Society had heterogeneous character. Caste and class awareness were significant influences. The caste component determined the nature of the party system. Traditional forces were outgrown by congressman defections and the advent of regional parties. Caste and class structures still play a role in political politics today. Indian National Congress, BJP (national parties), Indian National Lok Dal, Haryana Vikas Party, Haryana Janhit Congress, etc. are some of the political parties in Haryana (regional parties). Coalition politics have developed in the State

as a result of the emergence of numerous political parties. The state has extensive history with coalition governments and politics dating back to 1967. The state participated in coalition politics and government in the elections of 1967, 1977, 1987, 1996, 1999, 2000, and 2009. Dalai (2010), pages 18–29 Similar to how local parties gave rise to national politics, so did regional parties to state coalition politics. Bhagwat Dayal Sharma from the Congress was appointed as the state's chief minister after Haryana became a separate state. The State Congress leadership had the Jat leaders Devi Lai and Sher Singh fully trapped during the 1967 first assembly election. Bhagwat Dayal established the government, however the ministry disintegrated after a week. The first coalition administration was established by Rao Birender Singh. However, the newly formed coalition was unable to serve for the entire term because there was no clear reason for its formation other than to remove the Chief Minister who was already in office. Because of the national tsunami in favour of the Congress during the 1972 Assembly Elections, the Congress once again gained control of the state. The Congress was presided over by Bansi Lai for the duration of its tenure. Congress lost state authority in the 1977 Assembly Election. BLD (Devi Lai), Jan Sangh formed an alliance under the aegis of the Janata Party, which received popular support for its revolutionary policies and won both the federal and state elections. This alliance won 82 of the 90 State assembly seats and all 10 Lok Sabha seats. Only three seats were won by the Congress, five by the Vishal Haryana Party (VHP), and seven by independent candidates. Ch. Devi Lal served as Janata Party's chief minister during the formation of the government. The BLD predominated in that coalition since it was the first time in Haryana history that the Congress had been defeated by any combination. Second, the primary opposition group was a regional group as well (VHP). When Haryana contested its assembly elections in 1982, regional parties once more made a strong showing. 36 seats were won by the Congress (I), 31 by the Lok Dal, 6 by the BJP, 3 by the Congress (J), and 12 by independents. The Congress's seat distribution makes it very evident that the national factor played a role in its election to office. The Lok Dal and Congress only had a little seat gap. In 1987, the BJP and the Lok Dal combination regained power after a ten-year absence, with the Congress winning only 5 seats. This election was fought over the Ch.-initiated Nayay Youdh problem. Devi Lal opposed the 1985 Rajiv Longowala agreement. The Lok Dal-BJP alliance was viewed by the populace as Haryana's champion. For the first time, national factors had no effect on how people voted in Haryana. The Lok Dal and BJP partnership was chosen by the populace. With the vote, the Lok Dal and the BJP received 60 and 17 seats, respectively 38.88 and 10.53 percent. But this coalition government could not finish its term because of the excessive ambition of its leaders, especially Ch. Devi Lal his and his son Om Prakash Chautala.

Additionally, the coalition's dissolution was caused by the rising factionalism among the dominant parties. It was the second time that a regional and national party coalition government had failed because of rivalries and a desire for power. The Congress, led by

Bhajan Lai, became the government following the 1991 Assembly Elections. He held that position until 1996. During the Assembly Election in 1996, the BJP and Ch. Bansi Lai's Haryana Vikas Party (HVP) once more formed a coalition. Additionally, the coalition was formed prior to the election and had a clear plan for the state's development overall, including a total prohibition on the selling of alcohol. By gaining 33 and 11 seats from the HVP and BJP, respectively, with vote shares of 22.86 percent and 8.88 percent, this coalition came close to winning a majority. The Congress only received 9 seats with a 20.80 percent vote share, compared to Ch. Devi Lai's party's 24 seats with a 20.57 percent vote share. When the HVP-BJP-led coalition took office, Ch. Bansi Lai was the Chief Minister. The components' overwhelming ambition and desire resulted in the government in 1999 falling before completing its term as a result of widespread HVP defection and the BJP's withdrawal of support. Om Prakash Chautala of the Indian Lok Dal (INLD) formed a new coalition government with the BJP in 1999 after this one failed. Om Prakash Chautala pushed the state's assembly elections forward by 8 months and established an environment favorable to his government's election. With 47 and 6 seats, respectively, and vote shares of 29.64 percent and 8.9 percent, the INLD and BJP partnership won the 2000 Assembly Election. 21 seats were gained by the Congress, 2 by the HVP, and 1 by the Bahujan Samaj Party (BSP) because the INLD ran a number of proxy candidates against BJP candidates in the 2000 Assembly Election and the 14th Lok Sabha Election in 2004, there was no alliance between the two parties for the 2004 Assembly and Lok Sabha Elections. Second, the BJP broke off the partnership because it most likely foresaw a huge anti-incumbency wave against the Chautala. This aided the Congress in establishing the state's administration. The results of the 2004 elections show that in order for the BJP and INLD to form the state's administration, a pre-election coalition is required. Bhartiya Kisan Union (BKU) support was another element that helped the Congress win the 2004 election. Bhupender Singh Hooda, a leader in the Congress, frequently participated in BKU-organized processions. It has been noted that in the recent past, the parties that were closely associated with BKU won elections and established governments in Haryana. However, the demands of the BKU were disregarded by the Bansi Lai (1996) and Om Prakash Chautala (1999) governments. Farmers began to protest the government's decision to give them free electricity in 2001 after the BKU claimed that they would pay their electricity bills. This uprising peaked in May 2002 when BKU protestors blocked highways and held two police officer's captive in the Kandela hamlet of Jind district. In the absence of negotiations, the administration instructed police to open fire on farmers who were demonstrating in a number of different Jind and Rohtak district sites. Discontent among Haryana's farmers was stoked by the Chautala government's handling of the situation. It benefited the Congress since it was converted into an election issue. The Jat group is the largest in the state, and the bulk of them are farmers. Although Jats make up a sizable portion of the INLD's voter base, just 38% of them supported the party in the 2004 elections, compared to 26% who supported the Congress and 20% who supported the

BJP. A coalition between the INLD and the BJP was formed for the 2009 Lok Sabha Election, but it disintegrated on the day of the state assembly election over the minor matter of seat allotment. Before the 2009 general election, three alliances, the BSP + HJC, the BJP + HJC, and the INLD + BJP, all developed. However, the coalition collapsed even before the deadline for registering nominations. due to the identical problem of a 2004 equal seat distribution. In Haryana politics, no alliance was created for the 2009 Assembly Election.

The state politics of Haryana serve as proof that the two levels of politics are not the same. Traditional influences dominate the social and political structure of the state in states like Haryana where the population is predominately rural. Twenty percent of Haryana's population lives in urban areas. The BJP and the Congress are supported primarily in urban Haryana. In terms of rural Haryana, the overall population is 80%. The party politics in the state are significantly influenced by caste structures and class interests. Twenty percent of the state's population, the Jat agriculturalist community, supports the Lok Dal, one of the most significant regional parties in the state. To take on the Congress in the state, the INLD always relies on its alliance partner. BJP is the other party in the state. In order to win the urban vote in the State Assembly and Parliamentary Elections, the INLD tries to link itself with the BJP. The party additionally makes an effort to preserve its identity at the federal level by forming an affiliation with the national party. Despite the fact that there have been numerous instances of desertion in the Congress since 1967, it has consistently been a significant party in Haryana supported by a variety of interests. It is sponsored in part by the urban population, upper caste farmers and artists who are not farmers, as well as by Ahirs, Bionis, and Scheduled Castes. The INLD is regarded as the opposition party by all of these castes and classes. As a result, they back the Congress. Class interest is a significant issue in Haryana politics, and the Bhartiya Kisan Union (BKU), an organization of farmers, has the power to influence the state's political politics. Its favour or disfavor determines the state's power politics. The state's most recent three elections show that traditional and contemporary factors are combined in state politics. Due to the dysfunction of his administration over the course of five years (1999-2004), the development initiatives of the Chautala government were unable to produce significant outcomes. Congressman Bupinder Singh Hooda was appointed chief minister in 2004. It is a well-known fact that popularity and perseverance is based on how well it performs in gaining the national government's trust and successfully manage the state government.

CONCLUSION

India is a nation with many different identities. Only the multi-party parliamentary democracy could have better captured the plural nature of Indian society. The multi-party parliamentary democracy makes sure that all societal groups are represented in the political system. Therefore, the multi-party parliamentary form of democracy was preferred by those who drafted the Indian Constitution. Although there was a multi-party system in place in India when it gained independence, there was no power

struggle like there is in multi-party parliamentary democracies. That was primarily due to the Congress Party's inclusive nature, which represented practically all segments of Indian society. The other political groups, such as the Communist Party, Socialist Party, and Jana Sangh, were unable to have a significant impact on politics. His development initiatives and commitment to good governance enabled him to win the 2009 assembly and parliamentary elections. The BSP and Haryana Janhit Congress' electoral success in the 2009 elections shows that the caste cannot be the only element influencing political politics. The modern aspect of development plays a significant impact in party politics. Because of this, the structure of state politics suggests that a bi-nodal party system is developing in the state. Where there are two major parties, the other parties ally with them to make their presence known in local, state, and federal politics. Regional parties have emerged as an enduring phenomenon at the state level, according to analysis of Haryana's state politics. Every state has a unique party system that developed in accordance with its socio-cultural and economic structure. The two-party and multi-party systems differ in their systems. The acceptance of the populace in the states determines the significance of both national and regional parties. One thing is universally true across all states: only those political parties enjoy widespread support from the populace because they preserve and advance public interests alongside local, state, and federal interests. People are more concerned with the party's ability to articulate the development goals than they are with the party's worldview.

REFERENCES

1. Ahuja ML. Electoral Politics and General Elections in India: 1952-1998. New Delhi: Mittal Publication; 1998.
2. Bhambhri CP. Politics in India: 1992-1993. Delhi: Shipra Publication; 1993.
3. Bombwall KR. Regional Parties in Indian Politics: A Preview. In: Bhatnagar S, Kumar P, editors. Regional Political Parties in India. New Delhi: ESS ESS Publication; 1988.
4. Datta P. Regionalisation of Indian Politics. New Delhi: Starting Publishers Pvt. Ltd.; 1993.
5. Fadia B. State Politics in India, Vol. II. New Delhi: Radiant Publisher; 1984.
6. Gupta DC. Indian Government and Politics. Delhi: Vikas Publishing House; 1972.
7. Kothari R. Party System and Election Studies. Bombay: Allied Publication; 1967.
8. Pandey J. State Politics in India. New Delhi: Jawahar Publishing House; 1992.
9. Sharma S, editor. States Politics in India. New Delhi: Mittal Publications; 1995.
10. Singh MP, Mishra A, editors. Coalition Politics in India: Problems and Prospects. New Delhi: Manohar Publishers; 2004.
11. Thakurta PG, Raghuraman S. Divided We Stand: A time of Coalition. New Delhi: Sage Publication; 2007.
12. Dalai RS. Coalition Government and Politics in Haryana: A Historical Perspective. J Political Sci. 2010 Nov;6(2).
13. Joshi D, Rai P. Haryana: Landslide Victory for Congress. Econ Political Wkly. 2004 Dec;39(51).
14. Kumar A. Electoral Politics in Punjab: Study of Akali Dal. Econ Political Wkly. 2004 Apr;39(23).

Creative Commons (CC) License

This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) license. This license permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.