CHAPTER II

Socialist Movement of India – Various Phases

A. 1947 – 1977

B. 1977 – 1989

C. 1989 – 2004
SOCIALIST MOVEMENT IN INDIA

A. FROM 1947 – 1977

In the initial phase the socialist movement in India sprang up as an offshoot of the nationalist movement and grew up as its integral part. In the development of socialist movement the formation of the “Congress Socialist Party” is remembered as crucial. By this establishment, the radical orientation of Indian nationalism acquired a definite stage. On the other, the socialist idea or movement gained a foothold on Indian soil along with receiving the “Intellectual Framework”. There appeared some outstanding leaders, who within the Congress maintained a distinct political position due to their ideology and independent attitudes. They were conscious of their real strength in the Congress and visualized to turn the Congress into a socialist organization. There appeared the provision of dual membership. CSP ideology proclaimed the social ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange, planning not for profit making but for consumption and welfare of the people. From the inception, the party leadership was divided among 3 ideological tendencies of socialism namely(1)

1. Marxian Socialism – Jayaprakash Narayan and Acharya Narendra Dev
2. Fabian or social democratic socialism – M. R. Masani and Ashok Mehta

3. Socialism influenced by Gandhism – Achyut Patwardhan and Ram Manohar Lohia

There was a fourth strand which emphasized adherence to India’s culture, historical political background, often branded as Vedantic Socialism represented by Sampurnanand.

The Meerut conference of the CSP held in Feb, 1936 laid emphasis on Marxism – Leninism as its ideology, efforts were made to invite all the Marxist socialists under one stage. Thus CSP had opened its door for the Communists also who were banned up to that time but soon it appeared that both strands were differed not only in tactics but also in their attitudes and beliefs. Communists totally relied on Marx, Engel along with firm belief in violent revolution. On the other the Congress Socialists apart from Marxist inspiration hailed other sources like that of Vedanta, Gandhism and western democracy. For them at any level the Capitalist Democracy is much better than serfdom and alien rule. The Communists were having the habit of looking upon Soviet Union for all guidelines which sometimes extended to the level of anti-nationalism led to the total expulsion of communists from CSP in 1940.

But the members of the CSP group did not completely adopt the policies of the Congress party. The Congress leaders generally followed the Gandhian ideology of peaceful struggle whereas it was regarded as too slow by the Socialists. They pressed for quicker methods for bringing about economic equality. Their differences in objectives and methods led the CSP members to establish themselves as a separate group
distinct from the Congress followed which the socialists declined to participate in the Assembly elections of 1937 in the provinces. Their attitude was of Freedom first and Election Later, thus deprived themselves of the opportunity of gaining valuable administrative experience.

In 1942, with the onset of Quit India movement the CSP people were in the lead to intensify the movement. Achyut Patwardhan leading the movement with JP as the foremost attacker. J P was put behind the bars after the formation of Azad Dasta in Nepal. However, they again remained aloof from the process of development of a Constitutional government by negating the Central and provincial assembly elections in 1946 as proposed by Cabinet mission.

In fact up to that time there appeared a wide gap between the approaches of two blaming the Congress for their negotiations and reconciliations. The socialists were adamant on uncompromising militant methods. Soon after the release of J. P. in 1946 in an article ‘reorganize the congress’(2) JP called for revitalization of party cadre, not appreciated by Congress so they decided to drop the appellation of “Congress” from its name. On March 1947 in Kanpur it was done. In June 1947 Congress passed a resolution debarring any sort of ‘Groupism’ within Congress, advising socialists either to join the Congress sharing Governmental Responsibilities or to quit, which after the death of Gandhiji proved itself. Thus in March 1948 socialists quit the Congress. Thus Socialist movement geared further after a fourteen years long alignment with Congress. They cut the umbilical cord, with great expectation owing to their historic role in August Revolution including their close association with the congress and their adherence to
noble standards in their political behaviour. From Nasik onwards the watchwords were threefold,(3)

1. Struggle
2. Parliamentary activities
3. Constructive work

At the Nasik conference of 1948 they also adopted a new constitution, which featured individual mass membership, collective affiliation, emancipation of India, termination of old connections with the congress. One distinguishing feature was their acceptance of Democratic Socialism. The shift was due to the realization that

A. Conditions in India were quite different from that of Soviet Union
B. Impact of Gandhi and their close association with the Congress having faith in democratic methods.

The Decision of the socialist party to participate in the first general election was taken in July 1950. Just before the conference, Yusuf Mehrally who was to preside over the it passed away. At this time, Achyut Patwardhan also decided to leave the politics. In June, 1951 at Ranchi the General Council of the party finalized the election manifesto entitled ‘We build for socialism’ which in detail threw light on agrarian and industrial policy, constitutional reforms and foreign policy of India (4). The party refused to oscillate between Capitalism and Communism and endeavoured to prevent a third alternative, desired to bring an egalitarian society. The party also declared its pledge to remove all sorts of exploitation and to transform the society along socialist lines.
However, despite of the majority decision of the national executive that all prominent leaders should be ask to contest elections, J.P. and Lohia refused to oblige as they had anti-power streak in them. J. P. said,

“If all the important men were sent to the legislatures, this task of building up the popular bases and sanctions of socialism would be relegated to secondary importance.”(5)

One significant feature was that the party was dominated by not one leader but several leaders which became a factor contributing to the weakness of the party as a whole . In the matter of participation in elections, no unified national leadership could emerge and the image of the party remained weak in the eyes of the people. As a result the performance of the party in the first general elections held in 1952 was poor in terms of seats secured in Lok Sabha and the state assemblies as shown below,(6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE SOCIALIST PARTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lok Sabha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Assemblies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reasons ranges from putting up as many candidates as possible, to rely upon the mass discontent against Congress, lack of electoral experience, failure of
inspiring strategy and lack of resources. The party also failed in making electoral adjustments.

Along with the socialist party which emerged out of the former CSP was the party led by Acharya J. P. Kriplani named **Kisan Mazdoor Praja Party (KMPP)** with little difference of emphasis. This also included Praful Ghosh, Triloki Singh, T. Vishwanathan etc. It participated in 1952 election with success similar to that gained by socialist party.

### KMPP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of candidates</th>
<th>Seats secured</th>
<th>% of votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lok Sabha</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Assembly</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To the utter frustration of the socialists, the results indicated that in future the Communists and not the Socialists appeared as the alternative to the Congress.

### Comparative study of the four major parties (First General elections)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party Seats</th>
<th>Votes polled</th>
<th>% of votes</th>
<th>% of seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To Lohia, after the elections the socialists looked like clothes unironed (8). The electoral defeat caused wide frustration in party’s upper sections led to the infighting, recrimination and even character assassination. So in order to broad base the party and consolidate its position at the national level, the KMPP of Kriplani and the socialist party decided to merge and form a new party named *praja socialist party*.

Obviously it evoked mixed response. The merger was achieved on the grounds that both the parties had a common national heritage in their association with Congress, had faith in democratic methodology and tenants of Gandhism. But, the fusion could be realized because during the negotiations, ideological questions were set aside and only principles were discussed. The fusion showed that both sacrificed their ideological beliefs for ‘*Power Politics*’ which later resulted in internal quarrels, dissensions and ultimately cleavage in party. One another reason for internal conflicts was the presence of three divergent trends followed by the party’s “biggies”

A. JP leaned more and more toward Gandhism and Vinobha’s Bhodan movement.
B. Ashok Mehta came with the thesis of Compulsion of a backward economy and the notion of cooperation with the Congress in the task of nation building.

C. Lohia with the strong orientation in the form of “equi-distance” and equi-irrelevance” of both the Congress and the Communists.

1952-71 ERA OF INDECISION – SPLITTING MERGERS – THE FIRST ERA

The merger and the emergence of the Praja Socialist party failed in consolidating its position ideologically. Marked by a small success of playing a major role in the formation of Asian Socialist Conference at Rangoon in 1953 attended by the representatives of Japan, Burma, Malaysia, Israel and Yugoslavia, etc.

But apart from this, once again the Socialist Movement has presented external observers a sequence of events, witnessing an intensive period of merging and splitting which negatively weakened it as a force. The main discording events were,

1. J. P. - Nehru talks
2. Police shooting in Kerala
3. Awadhi declaration of Congress and coalition possibility
4. Crisis in Andhra
5. J. P’s withdrawal from active politics.

J. P. – Nehru Talks

After the panchmarhi special convention of the party. The most important issue was the question of cooperation with Congress whose bases was provided by Nehru's
invitation of talks to J. P. in 1953. Where J. P. offered Nehru a 14 point programme as a basis for cooperation including prominently:

   a) Constitutional amendments
   b) Land Reforms
   c) Unified trade union movement
   d) Nationalization of banks
   e) devolution of power

Nehru in return refused to tie himself down in any way, for this Morris Jones states;

   "Both side leaders wanted cooperation but found the other’s price too high.(9)"

Lohia in his article Attitude to government policy’ blamed the party for being plagued with a curiously indecisive and split attitude toward congress party. He also advised the PSP to develop a consistent mind.(10) The Betul special convention was held under the shadow of failure of J. P. Nehru talks where Ashok Mehta once again pressed for the thesis “Compulsions of a backward economy’ – cooperation with Congress on specific issues but was rejected by the hardnuts– Lohia, Limay led to the bitterness among the party’s rank and file.

2. POLICE SHOOTING IN KERALA & ANDHRA PRADESH
In March 1953 Nehru announced the formation of a new state of ‘Andhra’ where PSP allowed T. Prakasham to lead the government not accepted by Congress led to the prakashan resignation from PSP and the formation of a new praja party, which showed a ‘Deplorable Standard’ of conduct by a Party official.

This incident was followed by Kerala crisis where, after the defeat of Congress in the Assembly, fresh elections were held. PSP contested with Communists but failed to acquired the required number to form the government. So after a great deal of political adjustments PSP formed government in Cochin with the outside support of Congress.

This showed the PSP bankruptcy in terms of ‘ethical standards” raised conflicts within the party. On the other Tamil Nadu – Travancore – Cochin Congress started its agitation for linguistic reorganization of states wanted merger of Tamil speaking area of Travancore – Cochin with Madras. They launched demonstrations, strikes, violent presentations where police resort to firing and deaths of some volunteers. There appeared a kind of power tussle where Dr. Lohia directed the chief minister to resign and on the other the national executive of the PSP did’nt ordered this. Out of protest, Lohia resigned from the party post. Somehow the patch up was done but leaded the party into two factions:

1. Lohia Group

2. Non Lohia Group

J. P. WITHDRAWAL FROM ACTIVE POLITICS
At the Bodh Gaya Sammelan in 1954., J. P. announced Jeevandan, a pledge to devote his whole life to Bhoodan movement and to take no further part in party and power politics. The main reason of J. P.’s disgust were intra party squabbles, criticism of his talks and accusation of seeking power through PSP and Congress Cooperation.

**AWADHI SESSION OF CONGRESS – THE FINAL BLOW**

Just when the socialist party was recovering from various shocks, the Congress gave it a jolt through its diplomatic turn. The Congress at its Awadhi Session in 1955 resolved that its aim would be the establishment of a Socialist Pattern of Society which was immediately hailed by the Ashok Mehta group called for a review in PSP policy. This was challenged by Madhu Limay who wrote in free press journal that the Congress faith in socialism was a *Colossal Fraud.*

This controversy pained the ailing Narendra Dev, who as Chairman asked both factions to bridge the rift, but of no use. On Dec. 28, 1955 Lohia and Mehta parted ways at Hyderabad. Lohia created a new socialist party laid down its organs, aims, organization, policies, etc.

**THE SECOND ERA**

From 1955 onwards, according to Lohia, the Socialist party entered into a new phase, where its main objective was to achieve a socialist society by democratic and peaceful revolution, so in 1957 General elections,
a) The Socialist party of Lohia decided to go slow and PSP had electoral adjustments in Kerala Assam and Maharashtra.

b) The socialist party put up 37 candidates for Lok Sabha and won 8 only, put up 346 for state assemblies and won 52 only.

c) The Praja socialist party put up 135 for Lok Sabha got 19 elected put up 1102 for Assemblies got 135 only.

The socialist party failed to qualify as a national party so it was designated as independent section. No doubt in the second general election both the SP and PSP were saved from the crushing defeats, but they confused and bewildered the electorate by indulging in cut throat competition and putting candidates against each other.

In 1960, Lohia advocated Gherao, organized large scale civil disobedience movement, managed single aimed conferences such as –

Angrezi Hatao Sammelan

End caste conference

Fixed price conference

Compulsive Merger
Upto 3rd General election Lohia’s contention was to go alone in the election with major emphasis on defence under Chinese attack so as the election manifesto of the PSP of 1962 sub titled itself as the “Shape of Things Under Democratic Socialism”

But the election results once again demonstrated that the socialists had over-estimated their electoral chances reflected by the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>% of Votes</th>
<th>% of Seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congress</td>
<td>45.06</td>
<td>73.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSP</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CPI)</td>
<td>9.96</td>
<td>5.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialist</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This gave a rude shock to the socialists. The fact which made them restless was the steady decline in their all India strength and increasing displacement in most of the states. Along with the gloomy picture, one more controversy weakened the PSP – the Decision of Ashok Mehta to continue the PSP membership while accepting the Deputy Chairmanship of the Planning Commission – favouritism of Congress led to his expulsion from PSP.
The weakening of the PSP and the previous performance of the PSP and the SP in the 1962 election contributed to a new unity drive, which was first indicated by the PSP and SP members of the U P legislature. They decided to sit together as one party supported by Chandra Shekhar and and Raj Narain. They accepted the precondition of Lohia, approved the 1962 SP election manifesto. The party was later named as Samyukta Socialist Party (SSP).

However, this new party was formed without real agreement on the issue of ‘Lohia’s’ leadership, organization and policy. The issue of alliances with other parties particularly the Jan Sangh and CPI were especially important in public dialogue. Those PSP leaders who opposed Dr. Lohia’s notion of Non-Congressism left the SSP in January 1965 and revived the PSP.

The unconditional merger of SP and PSP could have been a success if both parties tried to understand the political questions in a united way. But the leading members of the SP misused this opportunity and pushed toward their line of alliances with other opposition parties thus paved the way for factionalism and distrust.

Subsequently the PSP left with the leaders such as S. N. Dwivedy, S. M. Joshi, M. R. Dandvate, Chandra Shekhar, Chandra Pratap, Tiwari, Prem Bhasin. Thus PSP emerged seriously weakened leaving the new SSP as the leading socialist party in India particularly in U. P. and Bihar.

FROM DISUNITY TO THE FAILURE OF NON CONGRESSISM
According to Lohia Non-Congressism involved five points:

- Opposition Consolidation
- Socialist Consolidation
- Joint action
- Single aim platforms
- Hard work and devoted labour

For Lohia who was the main architect of non-congressism, *continuity and stability are enemies of change* (12) Lohia even preferred Catastrophe to stagnation. His notion was based upon the idea that in India no single opposition party was in the position to emerge as an alternative to congress hence the opposition should come together on an Anti-Congress platform. Further False controversies on ideological labels such as left or right are irrelevant, as per non-congressism, toppling of Congress rule even with defection was not an immoral act. (13)

The election results of 1967 (Fourth) shocked the Congress as it suffered serious reverses and its monopoly over the entire country got a jolt. According to Michael Brecher with the elections of 1967,

‘India’ moved from a one plus party system to an embryonic multi party system”. (14)

Half a dozen Chief Ministers and a number of Union Ministers were defeated. Virtually all opposition parties benefitted in the elections. In fact socialists in general did not fare well. It could hardly have been a mass ideological or programmatic decision, rather it was an expression of frustration. Yet the policy of socialists to oust
the congress did fairly well. PSP organized 13 Lok Sabha seats while SSP gained 23 Lok Sabha seats. By the end of 1967 non congress coalition governments came into being in Nine States

- Punjab
- Bihar
- Uttar Pradesh
- Tamil Nadu
- Orissa
- Kerala
- Madhya Pradesh
- Haryana
- West Bengal

It was also during this period that the process of defection of members from one party to the another began. Clear cut ideologies began to blurred for the acquisition of the political power. There were parties which emerged from the Congress itself like Bhartiya Kranti Dal – by Chowdhary Charan Singh including J. P. Kriplani, V. Krishna Menon. Except in Kerala, the SSP was in non congress coalition which was headed by Congress defectors. Following SVD governments were formed with the leaders,

- Charan Singh in U.P.
- Govind Narayan Singh in Madhya Pradesh
- Ajoy Mukherjee in West Bengal
- Mahamaya Prasad Singh in Bihar
But for reality Non – Congressism could not sustain itself rather degenerated into the politics of SVD(Samyukta Vidhayak Dal).

The SVP Politics in practice was:

1. Lack of effective and serious political move to oust the Congress from the center.
2. Formation of Coalition of SSP Swatantra, RSS, Congress-o
3. No time bound radical programmes
4. Abuse of mass movements

In nutshell, SVDism was the Power greedy and opportunist version of Non-Congressism. Moreover there appeared 2 political lines on Non-Congressism.

A- Conceived by SSP
B- Insisted by CPI

**FAILURE OF NON-CONGRESSISM**

A. The main reason of their failure was the differences which arose between the Constituent parties while implementing the agreed plan. As Non-Congressism was based on a negative, slogan each constituent tried to improve its strength at the cost of other. Major period was wasted in mutual denunciation.

B. Serious personality clashes, prejudices, personal ambitious different political ideologies, sabotaged the policy.

C. To Iqbal Narain – the life story of the Coalition government is an unending tale of continuous bargaining with the sword of defection. Everybody
threatened to put the coalition government to ransom if not offered the ministerial post” (15) In defection, the socialists received more set back then any other constituents, reflected by the following data(16)

**Party Gains / Loses by Defection upto 1968**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Loses</th>
<th>Gain</th>
<th>Total Gain / Loses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congress</td>
<td>-98</td>
<td>-175</td>
<td>67-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Sangh</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swatantra</td>
<td>-53</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP / SSP</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSP</td>
<td>-93</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Bihar SSP clashed with Jan Sangh on the issue of land ceiling and crop sharing. In U. P. there appeared a clash between BKD and SSP on the issue of abolishing land revenue on uneconomic holdings. In Madhya Pradesh despite of SSP joining the government, PSP – Congress alliance tried to over ruled the SVD government. In Kerala the dissatisfaction over the seat allocation led to the withdrawal of SSP from Namboodripad government. All these happenings ultimately paved the way for the mid-term polls of 1969, in Punjab, UP, Bihar and West Bengal out of which in three states the socialists were in coalition. One more event which shocked the socialists was
the death of Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia in October 1967, leaving a kind of ideological vacuum in the movement and party progress itself.

The result of mid-term election in 1969 reduced the socialist's strength in West Bengal, Bihar and UP. Moreover, in the post Congress split era the SSP experiments with coalition politics also lowered its prestige like joining UP’s SVD government in 1970 and within a month its threat of withdrawal from the government.

It also appeared strange that SSP believed in radicalizing politics largely through power oriented Congress defectors which further accentuated the Intra –Coalition. Even Madhu Limay once remarked:

‘The SSP’s talk programme was a mask, behind which lay hidden office hunting by the party.’(17)

**ELECTION DEBACLE – SOCIALIST UNITY TO DISUNITY**

The unexpected dissolution of the fourth Lok Sabha on 27 December 1970 forced both the factions of socialist idea PSP and SSP to search electoral ties in order to retain their identity even with Congress but talks failed. The results of Lok Sabha elections 1971 came as a surprise to victors and to the vanquished alike. The Congress ( R) victory was beyond its imagination. On the other the PSP and SSP were reduced to such an insignificant position that their continuation as separate parties became totally meaningless.
PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS 1971 – RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congress</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPI</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSP</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSP</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THIRD MAJOR SPLIT – AN IDEOLOGICAL LEADERSHIP CRISIS

The socialist party faced crisis in April 1972 when Raj Narain filed his nomination papers for a Rajya Sabha seat after being denied by the Central Authorities, suspended from the party, accompanied by Karpuri Thakur recreated the SSP (Lohiawadi) whose aim was stated to be the restoration of the unity of socialist movement, contested against Madhu Limay in Patna. The reasons which were aired included Raj Narain opposition toward the merger of SSP and PSP. There was a fundamental division in the socialist movement. There were forces in SSP like Madhu Limay, George Fernandes who favoured the progressive socialist measures of Indira Gandhi and the other represented by Raj Narain and Thakur considering them fraudulent. Secondly, there was also a reason of controlling the “Party Machinery” where Raj Narain was losing. All
this reflect the absence of organizational unity and a pure socialist ideology in the movement.

Despite of the widespread frustration against the Congress the election results of five state assemblies in 1974 once again reflected the dismal performance of the socialist party. Out of 721 seats they managed to capture only 9 seats.

Now it was clear that if the leaders of PSP and SSP did not bury their hatchet they would soon wither away from Indian political scene. So the PSP – SSP unity talks were restarted in May 1971. They got a setback when PSP revived and some prominent leaders such as S. N. Dwivedy, Banke Bihari Das, Natwarlal Saha resigned from socialist party in August 1971. Somehow the united socialist party emerged on 9 August 1971 and released the election manifesto for assembly polls. The notable feature of the basic document of the socialist party, according to Hartmann was “its silence on the nature and form of socialism.”(18)

The Position appeared as follows

Chart showing the emergence of socialist parties upto 1971
J. P. MOVEMENT and the ROLE OF SOCIALISTS

Upto now the movement was already facing the pressures of leaders, disunity, lacking ideology but their vigour against the authoritarian rule of Congress had not lost its sharpness. The year 1974 dawned with mass protests and agitations firstly in Bihar and Gujarat later, spread throughout the country. Rising prices, mounting unemployment, uncontrollable burden of refugees headed by students unrest. The strong leadership of JP presented a strong platform to the socialists as well as to the other opposition parties to acquire, what they had dreamt of from ages, socio-economic transformation of society.
The thrust of the J P movement was for the Removal of Political Corruption, decentralization of the political power and along with creating a *National alternative to the Ruling Party.*”

During emergency while most of the socialists were arrested leaders like George Fernandes, Mrinal Gore, Karpuri Thakur became the symbol of underground activities S. M. Joshi utilized the limited freedom in mobilizing the people.

**Ist PHASE – 1947 to 1977 A CRITICAL VIEW POINT**

The first of socialist movement in India appeared more as a tale of mergers, splits, defects and fragmentation despite of raising high hopes among the people with the establishment of CSP in 1934. The socialists of India enriched traditional social thought but their endless debates over principles and programmes drained their energy and disabled them to act as swiftly in politics as communists did or surely as Congress performed. Before every split and merger ranging from 1934 to 1976 the question of cooperation with government in power or some form of coalition was constantly argued and debated from *Political Ethical Side.* In fact at a larger frame, socialists failed to transform their ideology in practice, principles in votes. Of course, the ideological mooring of Lohia, J. P., Narendra Deva offered new dimensions, explored new areas of public service and of needs like peasantry and workers, but Mutual Rifts led to the fragmentation and loosened Charisma to hold the national appeal.

**SECOND PHASE OF SOCIALIST MOVEMENT FROM 1977 TO 1989**
FROM COMPULSIVE BIRTH TO AUTOMATIC END OF JANATA POWER

Developments in the realm of politics that occurred in India in the year 1977 envisaged a new landmark in the annuals of the Post Independent history. It was the Emergency imposed by the Indira Gandhi regime which paved the way for a combined movement by the opposition. Of course except J. P. and Charan Singh of the BLD (Bharatiya Lok Dal) no party favoured the merger here the Socialist party’s stand was

“The socialist party had long ideological background for not rushing to merge with the parties” rather a credible left Democratic alternative would be a serious challenge to the Congress domination.(19)

The formation of Janata party was preceded by the announcement of holding the elections to the Sixth Lok Sabha in January 1977 immediately on January 20, 1977 the four non-communist parties.

a) Congress O

b) The Jan Sangh

c) The Bhartiya Lok Dal

d) Socialist Party

Agreed to work as one party “The new party was called as Janata Party and it was decided to fight elections under one flag and one symbol, one programme.

It has been written,“The real credit for bringing merger of parties goes to Mrs. Indira Gandhi who activated the whole opposition.(20)
The joining of these four was a response to the challenge posed by Indira Gandhi to the survival of opposition itself as well as to the party system. As maintained by Subramaniam Swamy “The emergency left the opposition with no choice but to come together.” (21) Surendra Mohan a Socialist leader said that his party’s will to fight against authoritarianism led the socialists to form Janata party. (22)

Soon before the elections Babu Jagjeevan Ram, Hemwati Nandan Bahuguna broke with Congress and joined Janata. Janata party opted for the BLD election symbol – ‘Peasant with a plough’ and reiterated in the manifesto. The new society it promises is not empty rhetoric like the ruling party’s socialism rather it will build from the bottom upwards in consonance with Gandhian philosophy of antodaya.

The results of 1977 election reveals a revolution of ballot, breaking congress monopoly at the centre.

Lok Sabha Election Results 1977

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congress</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Sangh</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congress O</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLD</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFD</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party</td>
<td>Seats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialist Party</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPI</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPM</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Janata Party</strong> – 299 led by Morarji Desai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Janata Party under Morarji Desai Prime Ministership took oath on 24th March, 1977 with Charan Singh as the Deputy Prime Minister, formalized the formation of Janata Party on May 1st, 1977.

Not only the formation but also the disintegration of the Janata government, which happened in 1979 reflected the failure of combined forces including the Socialists, it also evoked the same sharp and unimaginable response in the Indian Political scenario. The Euphoria of Janata party as an alternative to the Congress could not last long. The reason for this failure lies within its formative nature and the style of functioning since beginning.

**A. ABSENCE OF NATIONAL BASE**

A major challenge was its victory without establishing a national base like the southern states didn’t accept the Janata party in the election. Alongside, the state governments were still controlled by Congress.

So the Janata government after getting the recognition of a Janata party on May 1977, in a very swift action dissolved the state legislature assemblies of Bihar, Haryana,
U. P., West Bengal, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Rajasthan, Punjab, Himachal Pradesh to penetrate in the states. But this action was based on a wrong assumption that all constituent groups had actually merged and everyone is committed for the creation of a viable party organization. It was forgotten that four major Constituents BKD, BJS, Congress O, Socialist party had national, local level organizations, special wings who were not merged. The distribution of tickets became a controversial matter, led to the infightings within the Janata, especially between Charan Singh and party President Chandra Shekhar.

B. DIVERSE CHARACTERISTICS OF MAJOR CHARACTERS

The party leadership face of the hottest question of prime ministership for which there were 3 aspirants – Morarji Desai, Jagjeevan Ram, Charan Singh. According to V. K. Murthy “Desai arrived at the top, not by virtue, charisma or for his political services but he was the least common denominator in a situation of strong bias and distrust.” Leaving Charan Singh and Babu Jagjeevan Ram in utter dissatisfaction.

Besides, Morarji Desai, who had tried for the Prime Ministership in 1964 and 1966 also, the Cabinet included George considered Fernandes who was once an arch critic of Desai. It also included Jagjeevan, whom Morarji Desai had considered unworthy of Presidentship in 1969. Party was headed by Chandra Shekhar, an arch critic of Desai. H. N. Bahuguna and Biju Patnaik known for their ambition for prime ministership and, Charan Singh a known candidature for Prime-ministership. All shows vigorous and ambitious composition of Cabinet.”

C. IDEOLOGICAL CONFLICT – DUAL MEMBERSHIP ISSUE
The Janata party opted for open membership party organization. The basic trouble started on the Jana Sangh Constituent v/s other four Constituents. As the Jan Sangh members are the RSS members also, the whole confrontation given a theoretical shape of dual membership issue. In fact as George Fernandes feared it was widely understood that BJS with RSS power is orchestrating a Total Takeover of Janata party. So the Intra party feuds, the bliss to gain more than another, to control the party, to cut another base, personal ambitions to have more power share at every level continued within the Janata Party till it splitted in July 1979.

The cloud had burst and conflict became serious with Charan Singh resignation from the National Executive and parliamentary board, as his supporters in Haryana, UP and Bihar, were facing difficulties. He charged the top leadership for encouraging factionalism. The CFD, Congress O and Charan Singh raised the issue of discipline. Charan Singh of BLD accused them for this alienation led to his resignation from the Cabinet in June 1978 along with Raj Narain and demanded an enquiry into the charges of corruption against the son of Morarji Desai. This led to the battle line draw. The huge farmer rally by Charan Singh in December 1978 intensified the whole things.

**LACK OF COHESION**

The Janata party lacked an ideological cohesion which is an essential requisite of a political party; which was further abetted by a tendency of the personalization of the political ambitions. Like the conflict of “rural development strategy” between BLD of Charan Singh and CFD. By April 1979 it became clear that Congress (I) had a big hand in tearing the Janata party apart, so as the Charan Singh growing inclination toward
Congress ‘I’. So as the Janata government failed to face the no confidence motion in Lok Sabha and thus resigned on 15th July, 1979. On 16th July Charan Singh resigned from the Janata Party and formed a separate Janata (S) party.

On July 28, President asked Charan Singh to form the government enjoining, to seek a vote of confidence in Lok Sabha at the earliest opportunity. Thus shown in as the Prime Minister was totally entrapped by Indira Gandhi whose only aim was to topple Janata government so on the same day she withdrew her support. So, instead of going to house Charan Singh submitted his resignation on 20th August thus he lead only a “Caretaker government.”“In the Lok Sabha elections of 1980 the Janata party participated with four constituents:

1. Congress O
2. Jan Sangh
3. CFD
4. The Socialists

In the background of defections, personal discussions, breaking up of small factions, there came the 1980 general elections in which the Congress came back very strongly as the dominant party and the Janata party suffered a general electoral setback.

**STATEMENT OF JANATA PARTY POSITIONS IN 1980**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congress O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Sangh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Socialists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So in 1980, after the electoral debacle, Jagjeevan Ram parted company with the Janata party on the ground that he was not properly treated by party President – Chandra Shekhar. One of the major Constituent of Janata, the Jan Sangh went back to its own former organizational self but with a new name Bharatiya Janata Party (1980) BJP. Bahuguna also defected and joined Congress and was made the General Secretary of the Congress party. After the 1980’s victory, Congress took the advantage of his Muslims vote bank and kicked him out of the party.

The 1984 General elections saw a complete debacle of Janata power. Left only were Socialists and Congress O in its shadow with Chandra Shekhar as its president, who lost his own seat also in 1984 elections. This followed by a move started for the merger of Lok Dal and the Janata. In order to put pressure on the Janata Leadership, Many Janata workers including Raj Narain, Karpuri Thakur, Satyendra Narayan Singh joined the Lok Dal and later some of them defected to Congress I. The year 1988 saw the emergence of Janata Dal as a new party through a merger of some remaining members of the Janata party. The Lok Dal, The Jan Morcha and the Congress S with
leaders such as H. N. Bahuguna, V. P. Singh, Devi Lal and Chandra Shekhar. Its general policy was anti Congress and it attempted the formation of national alternative to the Congress through ‘Coalition of opposition”. Yet the issue of separate identities remain the same in Janata Dal. Each major leader had his own personal agenda and a coterie of strong followers and many of their actions were prompted by the compulsion to retain them own flocks like:

a) Devi Lal representing the rich Jat Peasantry upholding Ajgar (Ahir-Jal, Gujjar, Rajput) combination.

b) Chandra Shekhar viewed Prime ministership as his goal

c) V. P. Singh to out root Rajiv Gandhi government.

Once again in 1989, the opposition parties came together to put the Congress rule down, but not as a party but as a ‘front’ consisting of ‘separate’ parties supported the government only from outside. There appears nor merger. So Janata Dal remained a small political group organized for a limited objective. But the nature of the party changed because of its importance given by it to caste – base politics, rather it transformed itself into an instrument of creating vote bank. On the basis of caste and communal considerations without any reference to Ideology.” The 1989 elections produced the first hung Lok Sabha where Congress still emerged as the largest party but failed to get majority.

1989 – MINORITY GOVERNMENT OF JANATA DAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONGRESS – 189</th>
<th>OPPOSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Janata Dal alliance in 1989 (National Front)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Janata Dal</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telegu Desam</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMK</td>
<td>NIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congress S</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assam Swatantra Parishad</td>
<td>NIL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUPPORT TO JANATA FROM OUTSIDE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPI (M)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPI</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSP</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward Block</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BJP</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiv Sena</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Coalition government brought the two diametrically opposed political forces – BJP and the left under a broad coalition, since it gave them the opportunity to remain
in the Main Stream. This crisis that dramatically altered the fate of the National front government was formed on 2\textsuperscript{nd} December 1989 was both \textit{Internal and External}.

Internally, the principle difficulty arose from the political camp of Devi Lal, the Deputy Prime Minister whose son, the Haryana Chief Minister was forced to resign twice for his alleged involvement in violence and rigging in his own election of ‘Meham’ seat. This furthered by his resignation and accusation against Prime Minister, resignation of Arun Nehru, Asif M. Khan from the Cabinet and finally his withdrawal from the Cabinet and expulsion along with Chandra Shekhar. Externally the withdrawal of support by BJP immediately after L. K. Advani’s Rath Yatra became the cause. Thus, two issues brought the seal of fall of National Front Government.

A. Concerned with protective discrimination for the other Backward Castes (OBC’s) in government jobs on the line of Reservation for SC’s/ST’s. V.P. Singh decided to implement the Mandal Commission recommendation of 27% reservation for OBC’s without any consultation with allies, led to immolation of many student of upper and middle caste group throughout the country.

B. It was structured around Hindutva was based on the logic of majoritarianism led by Advani aiming at creating wave for BJP mobilized people for the destruction of Babri – Masjid and creating Ram Temple in Ayodhya.

The withdrawal of support led to the fall of Janata Dal government barely of 11 months old on 7 November, 1990 followed by a second ministry of Chandra Shekhar with his Samajwadi Janata Dal, installed on November 10, 1990 with the support of
Congress from outside for its own purpose. Continued only for five months, fell after
Congress withdrawal.

SECOND PHASE – 1977 TO 1989

CRITICAL VIEW POINT

In about 12 years from 1977 to 1989, the Janata Phenomena consisting of two
separate carriers of the Janata party and the Janata Dal came to an end. But both the
times despite of getting success in displacing Congress, the so called socialists failed to
provide a viable political alternatives. The merger and split became the identity of
Janata slogan and it loosened its credibility meanwhile the absence of Ideological
stance as happened there in earlier time also weakened its stature among public. Unlike
the BJP, the Janata Dal failed to consolidate its nationwide gains of 1989-90 led to its
meek survival in regional pockets. Janata Dal failure to make use of 1989 historic
opportunity in 1989 must be accounted for by its “Organizational – Leadership” failure;
the Dal draws upon the Laswellian sense of who gets what, when and how’ and the
dominant section is built and consolidated around the seemingly most capable
personality under the circumstances just like the irreparable lose caused by Devi Lal
and Chandra Shekhar. At the organizational junction, their policy of Temporariness paid
them heavily as Madhu Limay recorded:

“Janata Dal must quickly become a broad based national mainstream party by
absorbing into itself substantial elements from the Congress on the pain of its being
displaced by a revived Congress party. But Janata Dal chose to run a co federal
organizational network of its own. Its contract system reduced it into regional party after
the split of 1990 in the states of Rajasthan, Gujarat, Haryana as confirmed in 10th Lok Sabha elections.\(^{(25)}\)

THIRD PHASE FROM 1990 TO 2004

FROM THIRD FORCE TO DISINTEGRATED OPPORTUNISM

The form of coalition government, headed by V. P. Singh was first seen as an aberration produced by the failure of the Indian party system to throw up an one Party government. It also unshredded new themes in the Indian electoral scene namely Mandalization of the OBC identity politics and the advent of strong Hindu, Sikh, Islamic revivalism partly moderated by electoral – legislative coalition building, and as maintained by M. P. Singh a-renounced political scientist. Splits and mergers are an important part of the coalition game in India as it not only mean the forgoing of alliance between existing parties, but also the breaking of parties into spliter groups to facilitate alliances.\(^{(26)}\)

Instead of ideology, new issues appeared on the scene such as Social Justice, factionalism, Religion, Caste Orientation affected the viability of all parties added fuel to the “split – proneness” of Janata Party, which after the fall of V.P. Singh government divided by Chandra Shekhar and Samajwadi party in U. P.

The Nineth Lok Sabha was dissolved on March 3, 1991 announcing the polls. These elections saw the emergence of three main Distinct Electoral Formations.

1. National Front, Left Front

2. Congress ‘I’ and its allies
3. BJP and its allies

Moreover, the phenomena of Uniform sweep for any party across entire region, did not happen this time. For the first time, ideological political battle lines were drawn, new kind of realignment on ‘Caste Religion Base’ was formed. A lot of crossing of caste – community occurred. Janata Dal faced the polls under the shadow of U. P. Split along with sympathy wave for Congress assassination of Rajiv Gandhi in 1991 and Hindutva wave of BJP. The results led to the formation of Congress ‘I’ government with a initial minority tag which it later transformed in majority with Most Disappointing performance by Janata Dal as its popular vote went down from 17.66% in 1989 to 11.6% despite of its election call on the basis of Equity and Social Justice.

**1991 – TENTH LOK SABHA ELECTIONS PARTY POSITIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of seats</th>
<th>% of votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Congress</strong></td>
<td>226</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BJP</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Janata Dal</strong></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S. Janata party</strong></td>
<td>05</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Janata Dal’s ‘Mandal’ card was badly beaten in the electoral battle due to the ambiguities about implementation. The multi – concerned contest due to its split also paved its defeats as Madhu Limay said. “Janata Dal’s limited horizon was its limiting factor. Its ambition to become a power in a multi-cultural land by relying on a sectional appeal proved counterproductive.” (27)
28 seats in Bihar reflected the single handed leadership success of Laloo Prasad Yadav. The SJP of Chandra Shekhar reduced from 54 to 05, being showed the wider public rejection. The 1993 Assembly elections in Uttar Pradesh visualized two events in Janata Dal.

1. Severe Electoral set back at the hands of SP-BSP alliance.
2. A major split by George Fernandes along with Nitish Kumar.

In the background of Ajit Singh split by 1992 the Rift represented two views on whether the party could afford to restrict its political agenda to the Mandal plank. Unlike the Sharad – Lalu – Paswan Troika, Mr. Fernandes and other insisted that the issues were much larger called it Janata Dal (G) Later renamed as Samta. The structural contours of the Post 1989 can be synoptically conceptualized in a manner akin to the model of Kautilya’s theory of Rajmandala consisting of a series of concentric circles of friendly allies – ‘Mitra’ and unfriendly adversaries (ari) – like Congress and BJP neither reaching the majority mark, but being the two single largest parties attracts both Mitra and Ari into their gambit(28) represented sometimes by left, sometimes by socialists in the form of ‘third force’ as reflected in the forthcoming elections of 1996, 98, 99 in the form of Coalition government. By early 1990’s when Anti-Congressism waned a bit, another negative factor in coalition endeavours. Anti BJP’ism appeared on the scene and reached on a ‘Untouchable’ sort of heights. Along with this the Third Front or Third Force after 1977 and 1989 era, again appeared and gained power. What appeared to be constantly changing was its ‘constituents’ which were united neither in terms of ideology in terms of any attitude, with Janata force always at the centre of things. However, being a positive
force; the performance of the third force within a span of 10 years, reveals its
dramatic decline also. Basic reasons appears (29)

1. Failure of third force to form a government of its own.
2. Its inability to situate itself positively in the highly volatile and transient political arena.
3. Most of its power, energy and time engaged in sorting intra party – intra coalition’ dilemmas and conflicts.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Janata Dal</td>
<td>142 / 17.8</td>
<td>52 / 11.6</td>
<td>46 / 10.7</td>
<td>06 / 1.1</td>
<td>0/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPI (M)</td>
<td>33 / 6.5</td>
<td>35 / 6.6</td>
<td>32 / 6.6</td>
<td>32 / 16.7</td>
<td>33 / 6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPI</td>
<td>12 / 2.6</td>
<td>12 / 2.4</td>
<td>12 / 2.4</td>
<td>09 / 2.8</td>
<td>04 / 2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other left party</td>
<td>07 / 1.1</td>
<td>07 / 1.4</td>
<td>07 / 1.3</td>
<td>07 / 1.3</td>
<td>05 / 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMK</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>17 / 5.3</td>
<td>06 / 5.2</td>
<td>0/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samajwadi</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>17 / 5.2</td>
<td>20 / 6.1</td>
<td>26 / 6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janata Dal(S)</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>1 / 1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again the Janata quest for a third space began in 1996 when it received 46 seats and 10% of votes in elections, under the Banner of United Front a loosely knit hurriedly put together sort of post electoral front. This happened after the failure of BJP government of Vajpayee to muster the majority in the hung parliament despite of claiming 161 seats and the tag of single largest party. On 1st June, 1996, Dev Gowda sworn as the Prime Minister of United Front government consisting of 13 parties – JD (46), TDP (16), DMK (17), TMC (20), AGP (5), SP (17), KCP (1), MPVC (2), CPI (12), CPI (M) (32), FB (3), RSP (5), - Total 179 seats., with Congress outside support of 135 seats.

This ideologically heterogeneous, Polydic, Post Electoral – Minority coalition lasted only for 9 months with a letter of withdrawal by Sitaram Kesari on the issue of marginalizing Congress, followed by Replacement of Prime Minister by Inder Kumar Gujral took oath on 21st April 1991, again faced embarrassment on DMK issue and its involvement in Rajiv Gandhi’s murder led to the final withdrawal of Congress to UF government in November 1997, paving course to yet another Unfavourable general elections.

**SPLIT – which finally exhausts Janata**

From the SJP, the Haryana unit broke away to form the Haryana Lok Dal (Rashtriya). Later by Indian National Lok Dal led by former Chief Minister Om Prakash Chautala. Another regional spliter (which eventually merged with Congress). The Janata
Dal Gujrat, carved it own way. In May 1997 J.D’s major state unit in Bihar split under the leadership of Laloo Prasad Yadav formerly RJD (Rashtriya Janata Dal). Looking away 18 of JD’s 46 seats it followed by state wise splitting like

1. Lok Jan Shakti under Ram Krishna Hegde in Karnataka.
2. Biju Janata Dal by Navin Patnaik in Orissa.

In 1998, elections after the fall of UF Government, Janata Dal was decimated winning only 6 seats and 3.25% of vote and virtually wiped out in three strong hold states. All due to the splits. The splitters did fairly well upto this time No 'ism” was remained. The Biju Janata Dal with a seats and 27% of state votes joined BJP in forming the government so as Samata party getting 20 seats in Bihar aligned to BJP; Lok Jan Shakti party allied with BJP and acquired 3 seats and 11 of Karnataka votes. Samajwadi Party with 20 seats in U.P and RJP with 17 seats in Bihar reflected this trend.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final Tally of 1998 Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BJP and its allies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congress and its allies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The compulsions of coalition politics against worked with the formation of BJP government in March 1998 and its downfall by no conflict motion in April, 1999 paving
the way for yet another election. It was the numerous split phenomena of Janata, a major chunk of both fronts, which added power and strength to the National Democratic alliance of BJP to acquire victory once again in 1999 and forming the government with 23 other supporting parties as the NDA government. The final fate of the Janata Dal was written over by the Election Commission in September 2000, when it derecognize the Janata Party as a National Party and instead its 2 factions:

1. Janata Dal (Secular) of Dev Gowda
2. Janata Dal (United) of Sharad Yadav were recognized as Regional parties.
3.

13th LOK SABHA ELECTIONS RESLUTS 1999 (Janata in comparison)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Seats</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BJP</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>28.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congress</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>28.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPM</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samajwadi party</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.74 (U. P.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janata Dal (U)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.10 (Karnataka – Bihar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biju Janata Dal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.20 (Orissa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rashtriya Janata Dal</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>2.79 (Bihar)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This comparative positioning reveals that regional aspects, issues and so as the factions appeared on the scene, engaged themselves in the alliances – pre or post to acquire a future, leaving Janata as an empty Umbrella of a National type.

CRITICAL ASSESSMENT

FROM A GREAT HOPE TO A DISINTEGRATED FACTION

This institutionalization of procedures and processes is very crucial for any political party to sustain itself and to remain as a cohesive force in a competitive democratic polity. This is true for any party so as the ‘Janata Party’ having the great legacy of socialist orientation and movement. The party which started its carrier drawing its power from the ‘Socialist Movement’ with great ideological startwarts such as J.P., Lohia, Ashok Mehta, Acharya Narendra Dev, Kriplani, shown its glitter for here and while and then went their own fractional way without laying concretely its existence.

A. The socialist movement as depicted in various phases, lost its energy and charisma in endless debates over principles, programmes, without having a strong ‘Action Oriented Mass Mobilizing Policy.”

B. The main weakness of the Janata family of parties is and has always been organizational. They have always been the Most Weekly Organized of the major political parties certainly compared to the cadre based left parties and the BJP, but even compared to the mass based Congress at its worst period
of organizational decrepitude. They failed to manage to evolve even State Level organizational structures paying the way for *its numerous splits and mergers*.

C. Leadership Conflict: As suggested by Paul Brass (32) the Factional model of conflict explains the failure of socialist movement where *Personal Ambition* and struggle *for Personal position of power* and determining factors. For him the irony of the failure of the Indian Socialist movement is that it has not disintegrated because it could not achieve power, but because its leaders could not agree on the Leadership issue as well as the appreciate tactics to achieve power when it became available eg; Janata party government of all 1979, National front fall of 1989.

D. **POLITICIZATION OF SOCIAL BASE**: Since starting, the parties representing socialist ideals commend the support of peasants proprietors intermediate and lower castes in Northern which later extended to Muslims also but with *the Politicization of caste and religion after 1990’s* with Mandal Commission and Ram Janam Bhoomi conflict. The issue of social justice is widely used and misused by all other parties; so as done by Janata group, used *Preferential Patronage* badly affected by *Caste – Class – Overlapping Syndrome*. The search for separate identities and bases led to the splitters parties to join hands with strong adversaries also led to the dilution of *Socialist Ideology* itself.
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