Chapter – Second

Coalition Era of Bahujan Samaj Party
COALITION ERA OF BAHUJAN SAMAJ PARTY

World’s largest democracy and comparatively having stable and efficient government than its neighboring states, India is governed by a parliamentary form of government with federal structure. In such a state, political system was dominated by a secular party, ‘Congress’ till 1989. But it was the period of 1990s since when Indian political system, whether it is of central level or state level, is going to be frequently:

- Fractionalized, and
- Polarized

Existence of a number of political parties is referred by ‘Fractionalization’ and ‘Polarization’ refers to the ideological position of various parties in terms of their interactions and competition with each other. But the characteristic point of such a development is that it has given birth to the ‘alliance’ or ‘coalition’ system. However, alliances or coalitions, as a major product of fragmented and polarized political system, may be described as,

“Formation of a group by two or more persons against some threat which may be actual or potential”.¹

The term ‘coalition’, in Political Science, is a phenomenon of a multi-party government where a number of minority parties join hands for the purpose of running the government, which is otherwise not possible in a democracy, based on majority party system. A coalition came into existence when many splinter groups in the House agree to join hands on a common platform by sinking their broad differences and cobble a majority in the House.²

Such an alliance in politics may be categorized on the basis of:

- Institution of operation
- Organization of constituents
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• Political ideology
• Comparative strength
• Political power
• Area of operation
• Institutional reach
• Willingness of partners, and
• Party affiliation.

With the clear meaning and bases of coalition term in politics, now, it is to be clear the types of party system and coalitional system at state level in India. As being a federal state a political system is functioning in different states of India. So, party systems in Indian states are categorized in three types:

• Bi-party system
• Bi-coalition system
• Multiple - coalition system

Bi-party system is operational in states like: Gujarat, Delhi, Rajasthan, Himachal Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Orissa, Karnataka, Jammu & Kashmir and Punjab etc. In all these states, mainly two parties dominate the electoral proceedings and form the government. In most of the state BJP and Congress dominate while in other, Telugu Desam Party, Assam Gana Parishad, Janata Dal, Biju Janata Dal, National Conference and Akali Dal etc.

Second category party system i.e. Bi-coalitional system is operational in Kerala, West-Bengal, Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu etc. The essential features of this system functioning in some Indian states are:

• Existence of two polarized formations each having led by two different parties.
• Constituents of each political formation have electoral understanding among themselves for jointly contesting elections or sharing seats and forming Coalition Government, when voted into power.

• Each of two coalition groups works on the basis of “Common Minimum Programme” (CMP) irrespective of different ideological stands. For e.g. in Kerala ‘Left Democratic Front’ and ‘United Democratic Front’ are led and dominated by the Communist Party of India (Marxist) and Congress Party respectively.

• Shifting, of the smaller parties allegiance from one coalition to another, is another feature.

• Coordination Committee, of the coalition partners is another feature of this system, which resolves the internal contradictions among the parties that arise despite a Common Minimum Program (CMP).

Third category of the party system, ‘Multiple Coalition System’ is operational in states like Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Bihar and Uttar Pradesh. These Multiple Coalitions of parties, which exist along with many other major parties, contesting the elections independent of any coalition. The parties outside the coalitions may enter into ‘limited electrical adjustments’, friendly contests or constituency specific understanding with one another. In this system, there are more than two important power contenders aiming to form the government but not powerful enough to do it at their own or dictate terms to smaller parties neither powerful enough to electoral wipe them out as to happens in bi-party coalition system.

• In this system, smaller parties are powerful enough to challenge the dominant contenders through their own coalition.
• Or within a coalition if there exist a large party, they extract more number of
constituencies in their favor for contest.

• The polarization of forces does take place and it primarily veers around/
against the ruling coalition or with / against the dominant contestant. Yet, the
forces are not so polarized or there is no sharp division among them as it takes
place in the Bi-coalition system.

• That is, in this system once the elections ends and result is declared reflecting
Hung Assembly or simple majority for any coalition, reconfiguration of
political forces begins a fresh breaking all the proceeding alignments that
existed during the election period.

• In fact even if an electoral coalition is placed in governmental power by the
voters, the government may collapse within short duration for ahead of its
scheduled term under different pulls and pressure leading to the beginning of
another political/ electoral permutation and combination.

• Only in rare cases an electoral coalition or a coalition formed after election or
a single placed in power by voters have completed their tenure. As for
example in Uttar Pradesh in 1993, Samajwadi Party (SP) and Bahujan Samaj
Party (BSP) had formed alliance whereas “Bharatiya Janata Party” (BJP),
Congress and “Janata Dal” (JD) had contested the Assembly election
independently. Subsequently BJP and BSP had formed alliance and again
parted ways and contested the last election independently.

• Thus, due to electoral compulsions the parties keep on forming different
number of coalitions with partner’s changing. Even electoral opponents may
join hands in government formation.
• Or the parties split with a faction joining the government against the electoral stand of their parent parties. Splits in the BSP and Congress in UP are cases in point. The breakaway factions joined the BJP led government.

• Another characteristic is that irrespective of changing number of coalition and number of parties contesting the elections, there are broad but sharp polarization either in favor of or against the single largest party. For example in UP there is polarization in favor of or against the BJP.⁴

As for as Uttar Pradesh is concerned, here Multiple-coalition functions since the period of 1990s when UP’s politics came into the picture of fragmented and polarized system, along the lines of class, castes, religion and region etc. In such a system major players are: Samajwadi Party, Bahujan Samaj Party and Bharatiya Janata Party.

However, in order to know the Bahujan Samaj Party’s contribution role in coalition politics in UP’s political scenario, it has to be categorized BSP power politics into two phases ¹st and ²nd in terms of its Coalition Government:

A. BSP’s ¹st phase of coalition politics in Uttar Pradesh.

B. BSP’s ²nd phase of coalition politics in Uttar Pradesh.

A. Bahujan Samaj Party’s ¹st Phase of Coalition Politics in Uttar Pradesh:

Bahujan Samaj Party’s ¹st coalition phase starts with 1993 Uttar Pradesh Assembly elections when it came in ‘Pre-poll alliance’ with Samajwadi Party. It’s the period of 1993 in UP politics, which is characterized by the starting of BSP’s coalition era that was a move of BSP’s “Isolation Politics” to coalition politics.⁵ Another main point of this coalition was its position of “Historical Alliance” as it was the first time in UP political history when two rival parties came closer to each other to the extent that Coalition Government came into existence and marked a historical point. And it was
the BSP which has credit to move first step forward towards the starting of political relationship with Samajwadi Party.

Since then these parties have got various opportunities to become players in power politics and to hold and exercise political power sometimes through coalition arrangement between them or sometimes in isolation having the other parties support as BJP’s support to BSP in 1995 and 1997 elections.

But in order to understand the SP- BSP coalition of 1993, it should be clear that what were those reasons which transformed the UP’s political picture from single majority party governance to the Coalition Government in UP. In its background context, it is the period of 1990s when fragmentation and polarization, as the main point, has changed the whole political activities in UP since last decade. Till now, UP is in the process of fragmentation since 1990s. But the unique point in this process is its ‘undemocratic base’: ‘castes’ and ‘communities’. Undemocratic characteristic of UP’s political fragmentation has produced two major political parties representing different castes and communities:

- Bahujan Samaj Party
- Samajwadi Party

Another point related to this process is that it has marginalized Congress domination in UP’s political scene, automatically. Now, politically mobilized depressed community, (Dalits) under the leadership of Mayawati, blamed Congress Party for their deprivation and exploitation. Indeed Gandhiji’s denial of Ambedkar’s demand for a separate Dalit electorate in 1932 is perceived by Dalits as a original sin by him even Mayawati in her autobiography, has considered him as one of the perspectators of the ancient social stratification of Hindu society by Manu. And this
was Gandhi who became a hurdle in becoming Dalits an independent political force by threatening fast unto death against Ambedkar’s demand.

Besides these at initial stage of BSP, Mayawati in her electoral campaign to mobilize Dalits or bahuja community always questioned about the Congress’s scheme for Dalits such as about the advantages of various economic welfare schemes like- pig-herding, rickshaw pulling, leather tanning etc, initiated by Congress over past 40 years. Another question raised by Mayawati was that since 1952, 95% of Congress votes have been from Dalits while only 5% from Brahmins but in Congress ruled state only 5% Ministers are Dalits while 55% are Brahmins. Thus, through these campaigns, Mayawati created awareness among Dalits as a result of this Congress started losing its hold on this depressed community as a vote- bank.

Besides these two major contenders of power politics another is BJP, Bharatiya Janata Party with Hindutva Politics. So, the period after 1992 elections till 2007, UP Assembly Elections lack single majority party and it represents a number of political alliances that proved short lived and fragile. But before this alliance formation certain political developments took place or a situation raised which helped in the SP-BSP coalition formation in 1993. The ongoing situation of that time which contributed much in SP-BSP coalition formation, and acquisition and exercising power by coalition formation were:

- BJP’s “Rath Yatra” to Ayodhya in 1990s: This led the communal polarization of BJP beneficial to the electoral politics. Demolition of Babri masjid on 6th December, 1992 created such an atmosphere in UP and other states that Dalits, Muslims and Backwards organized together politically and by forming an “electoral alliance” they wanted to curtail BJP from coming into power. Such prevailed situation gave origin to the: “unsecular power
"politics" in the form of political mobilization of people on communal and caste lines termed as:

- Caste-based mobilization
- Religion-based mobilization

Caste-based mobilization was made by SP-BSP alliance with anti-BJP sentiments among Dalits, backwards and Muslims to serve their purpose of alignment of political power, BSP was anti BJP because of its assertion that BJP is the manuwadi party of upper castes who are the exploiters of SCs while SP, as a party of backwards and Muslims, mobilized Muslim vote-bank by claiming its stand as the protector to the interest of Muslims from BJP threat of Hindutva ideology and Backward Castes interests from upper-castes Hindus. While BJP aimed to unite the entire Hindu community on ideological basis, religion-based mobilization.

- Opposition to Mulayam Singh Government:

At that time, Janata Dal Chief Minister; Mulayam Singh of UP cracked down the agitators which resulted into the opposition to Mulayam Singh Government and was being criticized as ‘Mullah Mulayam’ by the BJP. As he stood with the favor of Muslims in Babri masjid cause, as he wanted to woo the Muslims’ vote in his party’s favor, they were the Congress vote bank till then. Apart from Muslims, Yadavs also formed support base to Mulayam Singh Party who accounts for 10% of UP’s population.

- BJP convinced some part of MBCs: But it also true that some of the ‘Most Backward Castes’ (MBCs) among OBCs did not supported Janata Dal as they were convinced by BJP on this basis that they were not going to be benefited with Mandal Commission’s recommendations implementation. However, BJP
mobilized them in its favor for its Ram Temple issue. Thus, a four-cornered fight started among:

- Janata Dal
- BJP
- Congress
- BSP

**Fall of V.P. Singh Government:** Janata Dal split with the fall of V.P. Singh Government and SJP. “Samajwadi Janata Party” was formed by Yadavs and headed by Chandra Shekhar who replaced V.P. Singh with the Congress support at Centre, as a P.M. While Ajit Singh remained the head of Janata Party as a leader of Jats in western UP and Haryana, with this split Janata Dal became weak and dependent upon Congress. So, it was the main Congress Party which was supporting Janata Party government both at Centre as well as state level in UP.

**Withdrawal of Congress Support:** It withdrew its support from the “Samajwadi Janata Party” (SJP) at Centre which automatically fell down the UP Government. As it was perceived by the Congress that Yadav’s firm standing for Yadav/OBCs would alienate upper castes from the party, Congress and divert to the BJP and was a perceived threat to the Congress’s Muslim vote bank. All these political activities resulted into the 1991 UP Assembly elections with the BJP’s expectation as a winner of the election because of certain points:

- Split in the Janata Party
- Ram Temple Issue
- Kalyan Singh, a person of Lodh Community (OBC) whose projection as the Chief Ministerial candidate. This helped BJP to win over a section of Non-Yadav OBCs particularly, Lodhs and Kurmis. All these rewarded BJP, a
victory with 221 seats in the 425 member assembly in mid-term UP Assembly Polls 1991. But BJP government lasted in December 1992 with Babri masjid demolition, followed by the imposition of ‘President’s Rule’ in UP till fresh elections to the UP state Assembly held in 1993.9

Thus, all these political activities in UP from the early of 1990 resulted into the end of single party majority government and the lack of single majority party started a new-chapter of “coalition era” in UP Politics.

Bahujan Samaj Party’s (BSP) chapter of coalition era in Uttar Pradesh with Samajwadi Party (SP) of 1993 Assembly elections is started with an electoral strategy adopted by Kanshi Ram even before the elections. That strategy was the formation of an “electoral alliance.” Kanshi Ram entered into an alliance with Mulayam Singh even before the Assembly elections 1993. But the unique point of this alliance was that the primary vote banks of the two men were contrary: the Yadavs and the Chamars; so this was not a “Natural alliance”, as these two communities had always been in violent activities or conflicts in villages.10

The points, which made the BSP to acknowledge the possibility of such type of unnatural alliance between BSP and SP, parties of rival sections of society, were:

- Bahujan Samaj Party (BSP) as a party of Dalits realized the impossibility of capturing power in the absence of support of the Backwards and Muslims. Its base (Dalits) constitute only 21% of UP’s population and such a limited base could not help BSP in its achievement of power. In 1993, BSP moved closer to the SP and as an Ambedkarite party it tried to construct a ‘Bahujan Samaj’ based on the support of Dalits, Backwards, Tribal and Minorities. And with the SP- BSP Coalition Government formation, its realization to broaden its base during 1993 Assembly elections, such a thought came into practice.11
However, with all political activities as unsecular mobilization strategy on castes and communal lines, pre-electoral alliance, UP Assembly elections 1993 started with sub-regional politics. In varied sub-regions of Uttar Pradesh, the electoral competition, among parties, were different in terms of number of seats and votes percentage, as:

- Uttarakhand: Competition was between Congress and the “Bahujan Samaj Party” (BJP), but BJP lost 1.8% votes.
- Upper Doab: Jat land where BJP was in improved position with 2.7% votes and 13 seats.
- Bundelkhand: A highest Muslim populated region where BJP lost 2.8% votes and 10 seats while Mulayam Singh was supported by 7.9% votes and 13 seats.
- Avadh: Both BJP and SP-BSP polled same share of votes. SP-BSP 52 seats while BJP 37.
- Poorvanchal: BJP gained 3% votes but lost 16 seats. SP-BSP Alliance captured 55 seats.

With unsecular mobilization, 1993 elections result put BJP out of power when BJP defeated in three states out of four except Rajasthan. Though BJP won only 177 seats less than 1991 elections- 221, yet BJP gain increased number of votes from 31.6% to 33.4%. In this situation of unfavorable condition towards BJP; SP-BSP joined hands with each other and gained 28.7% votes and 176 seats together, 109 (SP) and 67 (BSP). Thus, the SP-BSP alliance and the BJP emerged as the largest groups with 176 members each in the 425 state assembly, through short of a majority by about 37 seats. Janata Dal managed to win just 27 seats and the Congress a mere 29 seats, by for the lowest number of MLAs it had ever had in the UP Assembly. Given the composition of the Assembly, both the Janata Dal and the Congress, as also the
four MLAs from the left parties, had little choice but to support a Yadav led SP-BSP government to keep the BJP out of power. While the Congress lost about 2.4 percent of the vote from 1992 elections, the BJP and the BSP gained about 2% each. The major loser was the Janata Dal whose share of vote dropped from 18.8% in 1991 to 12.2% in 1993, most of its loss benefited the SP, which had won 12.5% of the votes in 1991, but now managed 18%.

Table No. 11: Political Parties Share of Seats & Votes Percentage during 1993 UP Assembly Elections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parties</th>
<th>Seats (Won)</th>
<th>Votes Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bharatiya Janata Party</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samajwadi Party</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>25.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahujan Samaj Party</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congress</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janata Dal</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In this way, Coalition Government was formed by SP-BSP and UP Assembly was constituted. But the first day of the Assembly was started with the violent incident between BJP MLAs on one hand and SP-BSP MLAs on the other.13

- Kanshi Ram’s electoral strategy of the forming Coalition Government became true even with the lack of the potential for longevity. But in spite of such attempt to improve from above conflicting forces that were inherently opposed to each other and had conflicting interests. With the realization of unnatural alliance, attempts were made by both parties for the successful survival of their alliance like: division of seats between them, yet contradictions or
clashes prevailed and emerged as a threat to the existence of the alliance, which proved to be the ground of failure of such power-alliance, that were:

- First point which proved to be the major ground for the collapse of alliance was the “same block of votes” Dalits, Backwards, while BSP’s was of Dalits. But the contradictions started between these partners of same alliance when Mulayam Singh appeared to be the gainer and emerged as the dominant partner in the coalition by taking credit of the appointment of Urdu teachers, reservations in schools and inducting the backwards specially Yadavs in State Police Force; and Public Accounts Committee (PAC).14

Old-aged rivalry between Dalits and OBCs stands as a challenge in the way of successful survival of the alliance and a series of hostilities between the two coalition partners reached the alliance up to the point of collapse with the final act of BSP, its withdrawal of support to Mulayam Singh led UP’s Coalition Government. Before final ending the politics going on were the acts played by Kanshi Ram and Mayawati of using public platforms to bring Mulayam Singh Yadav’s move towards strengthening his claim as the champion of OBCs in the state before public. This was proved with Mulayam Singh’s decision in 2000 to extend the reservation for OBCs in government jobs to the hill districts of the state, now, known as Uttarakhand, this area was the most dominated by upper-castes mainly with Brahmins and Rajputs, while Dalits too had a significant presence, though less than in the plains, and the OBCs were conspicuous by their absence. The attempts to introduce reservations in these areas, were, therefore, viewed as just another instance of people from the plains trying to exploit the hill folk.

Another act for which BSP criticized the SP was to engineer a split in the BSP’s rank, particularly among the Muslim and non-Dalit MLAs of the party which
was seen in the May, 1995. In these elections, the SP used muscle power not just to defeat the BJP and Congress candidates, but also BSP candidates.\(^{15}\)

Finally, all contradictions, clashes and conflicts, the fighting grounds between these two coalitions partners- 1993 UP elections came to an end (only in the sense of fall of Coalition Government) by the withdrawal of BSP’s support on 1\(^{st}\) June, 1995 but administrative crisis emerged in UP’s political scene as Mulayam Singh Government in UP dismissed while Mayawati claimed to form the Government with the help of BJP. So, she was given the time of two weeks to prove her majority in the House, ‘Legislative Assembly’.\(^{16}\) Meanwhile Government banned all political meetings and rallies throughout the state till further order to maintain peace. But on 9\(^{th}\) June, 1995 UP’s Governor, Moti Lal Vora refused to give more time than 15 days to Mayawati to prove her majority. So, on June 19- 20, 1995 the day was scheduled to be for voting.\(^{17}\)

But in this power-politics, the main sufferer may be said to BSP as of its internal split. Its own MLAs revolted against it and supported Mulayam Singh’s party on 2\(^{nd}\) June, 1995. While 25 BSP MLAs formed rival party under former Union Ministers Raj Bahadur known as “Asli BSP” later on called as ‘BSP Raj Bahadur’.\(^{18}\) But 10 out of 25 BSP MLAs, Raj Bahadur faction, returned to their parent party on 4\(^{th}\) June, 1995.\(^{19}\) Finally, Mayawati secured the outside support of the BJP. So, Governor dismissed Mulayam Singh led Coalition Government and a new Government, with Mayawati as Chief-Minister, came into existence.

**B. Bahujan Samaj Party’s IInd Phase of Coalition Politics in Uttar Pradesh:**

The great beneficiary of the SP-BSP alliance breakup was BJP. Such an alliance was perceived by the BJP as a threat to its supremacy or power control. But with the SP-
BSP alliance breakup on 1st June, 1995 it stated that it wanted to keep Mulayam Singh Yadav’s Government out of power but the intention was to capture BSP’s vote bank.

So, with the withdrawal of the SP- BSP Coalition Era, 1993 characterized with the Mandir- Mandal issues, a new strategy was adopted by BSP to widen its social base and acquire political power. Though this time also it was in coalition but with changed partner from SP to BJP and this second coalitional phase was termed as “Post- bahujan Phase”. Because the strategies adopted by BSP during this phase, to capture political power were:

- Coalitions with upper-caste parties; and
- Tickets to non-Dalit candidates

Post-bahujan, in terms of its changed Bahujan (SCs, STs, OBCs and Muslims) ideology to Post-bahujan ideology, includes upper castes and non-Dalits, may be said as the phase of ‘Modernization.’ With the changed strategy, it formed Coalition Government with BJP on 3rd June, 1995 Mayawati as the Chief Minister. The distinctive point between the two coalition periods of BSP, with SP-1993 and BJP 1995-97 is that in 1993 it had SP as coalition partner as a party of backwards who are also the constituent part of bahujan, while in 1995 its coalition with BJP showed its Post-bahujan strategy an alignment with upper caste party, BJP. This changed move of the party was described by Mayawati as a temporary and tactical method to gain power.20

In this context of 11th phase of BSP coalition, it is clear that in the split between two parties a major role was played by the BJP as it perceived the new alliance of victimized society as a great threat to its supremacy in power politics. Therefore, it became essential on the part of BJP to support BSP. Thus, in June, 1995 Mayawati was given the role of Chief Minister of UP. Though she was the C.M. but
the 1995 UP Government is properly known as a Joint Kanshi Ram- Mayawati Government as he was consulted by Mayawati on all major decisions.

Being the Chief-Minister, Mayawati implemented a number of socio-economic and cultural policies in the interest of Dalits particularly, and Muslims and OBCs. Her pro-Dalit policies became a contradictory point between BJP and BSP. For example:

- High castes incumbents in the Chief Secretary and Chief-Minister’s Principal Private Secretary Positions were replaced by Scheduled Caste officers. And SCs officers on different positions were being promoted. Such an act was criticized as ‘merit had been replaced by casteism.’

- She made resort to the device of transfers and disciplinary action against officers found delinquent in one aspect or another.  

As for as transfers of officials on a large number is concerned it was also stated that BSP supremo, Mayawati was taking BJP support only to attack on Mulayam Singh in political field. As his decisions were reserved at every level, his men were targeted- District Magistrates, “Superintendents of Police” (SPs) and officials, who were being used by politicians for their power play, were transferred. And “Samajwadi Party” (SP) ruled districts where there were criminals, political nexus system were ended.  

Another criticism regarding BSP during its period of power was in the context of illicit money which it exacted in the matter of obliging individual bureaucrats regarding their transfer or non-transfer may be said as misuse of public office or official corruption.

Mayawati’s style of administration was also criticized for her most provocative gesture. In March 1994 during Mulayam Singh Government Mayawati
condemned Mahatma Gandhi as ‘an enemy of Dalits and the Bahujan Samaj’ at large.’ Another gesture of her Government was to build a ‘Parivartan Chowk’ or revolution square in Lucknow that was to have huge status of the great figures of anti-Brahmin activism: Phule, Periyar, Ambedkar, Shahu Maharaj. Mayawati also organized Periyar Mela in Lucknow, despite BJP’s opposition. As leaders of VHP and Bajrang Dal pressurized Mayawati not to go ahead with Periyar Mela in the city and requesting her to glorify another leader instead of E.V. Ramaswamy Periyar who had deliberately hurt the Hindu sentiments by opposing idol worship on 13th September, 1995.

BSP-BJP coalition, 1995 as BSP’s another strategy to capture power by aligning itself with upper-castes party, “Bharatiya Janata Party” (BJP). Here BSP’s this move may also be said as a unique one because of its alignment with such party to whom BSP had always been in opposition. But such a move became also failed when BJP withdrew its support from BSP as a result of Mayawati’s own style of administration. Eventually, Bhartiya Janata Party (BJP) decided to withdrew its support to the four and a half month old BSP Government led by Mayawati under the supervision of Kanshi Ram. BJP’s act was in pressure from its own state unit led by Kalyan Singh (former Chief Minister) to withdraw support to Mayawati regime. Otherwise, he would walkout from the party with 70 MLAs. This was only because of the growing assertiveness of Mayawati, causing unease in BJP. And its growing appeal among the backwards in general and Dalits in particular. The growing position of BSP was perceived by Kalyan Singh as a threat to its support base, backwards. Though central leadership did not want to go for a breakup of the alliance, yet it had to withdrawn its support to BSP because of Kalyan Singh’s force to take such step which was essential for BJP to keep its party united.
In this way, BSP Government supported by BJP fell down when BJP withdrew its support to it in October, 1995. So, on 17th October, 1995 UP Chief Minister, Mayawati submitted her resignation to state Governor, Motilal Vora in Lucknow. He accepted Mayawati’s resignation and her Cabinet but asked her to continue till arrangements were made to form the Government. In such a situation, Mulayam Singh Yadav told not to extend his support to BSP. And said his party was preparing for elections and people would decide about its next government in Uttar Pradesh. On 18th October, 1995, Uttar Pradesh was placed under President’s Rule and suspension of State Assembly took place, not dissolve. But the demands were made by BJP to dissolve the UP Assembly elections along with the forthcoming Lok Sabha polls. While it was the Samajwadi Party which said that centre is providing time to the BJP to form the government in state.26

- **1996 Uttar Pradesh Assembly Elections: (Hung Assembly)**

Because of the BJP’s move towards the BSP, as to withdraw its outside support from Mayawati Government, President’s Rule played its role in UP since 1995 to 1996 Assembly elections. This time UP Assembly elections had its own unique chapter in UP politics as it moved around various stages:

- BJP’s support to BSP;
- 1996 pre-poll alliance with Congress;
- Election result produced Hung Assembly in UP;
- BSP-BJP Coalition arrangement-1997;
- BSP’s withdrawal of support-1997 etc.

1996 UP Assembly elections showed a new type in political process in this state with the shift of political focus. During this period, BSP had emerged an important political force of Dalits in UP. But BSP’s focus during this election was not
on Dalits and Backwards, and to capture political power but was only raising voice against Mulayam Singh with the focus on ‘Romesh Chandra Report. With this issue another focus was on to bring the support of the upper castes, both the Thakurs and Brahmins. But the contradictory point was that the same section was also tried by the United Front as its vote bank, it was mainly concentrating on farmers, youths and Muslims. While Muslims were still with Mulayam Singh but a section of their elite leadership was inclining towards the Congress-BSP combine. Another caste, Most Backward Castes (MBCs) was being attracted by BJP, mainly the Kurmi vote-bank by projection of Kalyan Singh as the future Chief Minister.27

So, BSP’s chapter of Coalition Politics during this period was started with the ‘Pre-poll alliance’ with the Congress Party, which was an alliance of Post-Mandal, Post-Mandir phenomenon, only to increase the number of votes. This time BSP’s strategy was to keep the party’s Dalit constituency:

- Intact by promising to make Mayawati the Chief Minister;
- By giving about 30% of its tickets to Dalits and backwards and a much lower percentage to the upper castes; and
- Was trying to gain Muslim support by making anti-communalism a part of its election campaign by promising them as it would not form any agreement with the Bharatiya Janata Party after the elections and gave tickets to 52 Muslims.28

During this period of President’s Rule and before the holding of 1996 Assembly elections; Romesh Bhandari was appointed as Governor of Uttar Pradesh on 16th June, 1996 mainly favored by Prime Minister, Deve Gowda. Romesh Bhandari as a new appointed Governor was given certain specific tasks by Prime Minister:

- To control the law and order situation in UP; and
- To conduct free and fair polls in UP.
Regarding the elections, political parties were playing its caste-card strategy to woo the voters for achieving power. With this electoral politics the election dates were announced on 29th August, 1996 which was to be held in three phases. On 30th September, first phase of elections started with no violence but during second phase some incidents of violence were reported in Muzaffarnagar, Fatehnagar and Badaun Districts of UP. And not to reimpose the President’s Rule, the essential condition was either a pre-poll alliance or even a near majority. But during election the U.P’s political scene was as:

- SP and BSP would not get together because of the personalities clash. This became very clear when BSP supremo, Kanshi Ram asserted on 18th July, he will never align with “Janata Dal” (JD) for the coming Assembly elections in UP if the latter continues to have an alliance with the Samajwadi Party of Defence Minsiter and former state C.M, Mulayam Singh Yadav.

- There was a pre-poll alliance of BSP and Congress. In fact, Congress- BSP alliance for ensuring Assembly polls in “United Front” announced much earlier. This provoked adverse reaction in the UF and a section of the Congress Party became unhappy because PV Narsimha Rao has not taken the Congress Working Committee into confidence before going to enter into an alliance with BSP.

Kanshi Ram asked Congress to filled 100 Brahmans in 125 seats allotted to it, so as to attract the upper castes, from the BJP to Congress back. And he also divided the seats among the candidates of his own list; according to communitarian formula. However, in 1996 assembly elections the BSP gave 28 percent tickets to SCs, 24 per cent to OBCs, 18 percent to Muslims, and 16.6 percent to upper castes candidates.
And Congress had outside support to UF Government at Centre. So, it was expecting that “United Front” (UF) would support BSP-Congress alliance.

- “United Front” (UF) comprising “Samajwadi Party” (SP), “Janata Dal” (JD), Left Front, Congress (T) and BKKP on one hand; and the Congress-BSP alliance on other hand, both were opposing BJP;
- Counting of votes started on 10th October, 1996.

In 1996 elections: BJP won 174 seats; SP won 110 seats, BSP won 67 seats while Congress 33. And the poll result proved it that no party or coalition had secured an absolute majority.

**Table No. 12: 1996 UP Assembly Elections Result in Terms of Political Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Groups</th>
<th>Seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BJP-Samata Party</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-United Front</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSP-Congress</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Thus, three major parties were BJP, BSP and SP. And for any political stability in UP politics without two out of three getting together only a Government based on defectors could be formed. Congress-BSP alliance jointly had strength of 100 MLAs while BJP have to depend upon split the Congress. It was expected that “United Front” (UF) Government would support Congress-BSP alliance with Mayawati as the Chief Minister but the hindrance in this strategy was the unreadiness of Mulayam Singh to support this alliance. So, UF also could not go against SP. During this period of BSP-Congress and UF talk, BJP remained busy in wooing the smaller parties and to break some larger parties. In this split game the Congress was in vulnerable condition as its 11 MLAs out of 33 would be adequate to meet the
provisions of the anti-defection laws because private discussions were going on between BJP and their MLAs. The BSP’s position was also susceptible. Its 67 MLAs were comprised of: 10 upper castes, 11 Muslims, 27 OBCs and 19 SCs. And BJP could split 10 upper castes members easily. And OBCs member could also be allured as Kalyan Singh belonged to a backward caste.

Thus, with all these suspicious or threat perceived by Congress and BSP on the part of its MLAs of being split by BJP to come in power, the dialogue was continued between the Congress and UF regarding the support to Congress-BSP alliance. On 12th October Congress Working Committee member, A.K. Antony says the U.F. should “read the writing on the will” and support the Congress-BSP alliance to form the government in UP if it ‘believes in fair play’. But this dialogue could not come to the conclusion because of the Mulayam Singh’s opposition. And the situation of UP politics was that there was no single majority party to form the Government, though BJP was the single largest party. Having seen the BJP’s largest votes the UF Steering Committee decided to ask all “secular parties” to write to the UP Governor to invite the BJP to form the government, as the people had given a “clear-majority” to the secular parties dealing to a body blow to the communal forces. During such a critical situation, BSP’s chief, Kanshi Ram, with a determined intention, said that the option seeking the BJP’s support was open to his party, which was clear with a statement, of Kanshi Ram, on the status of the Congress as an ally in case of an alliance with the BJP; that “If the BJP becomes our ally, the Congress cannot remain our ally.” This would not mean a breach of trust as “Bahujan Samaj” is in majority so, it must rule. And the dangerous point at that time was the ending of President’s Rule on 17th October, 1996 after 12 months. And President’s Rule could not be extended as per the Constitutional provision. So, this was the critical situation and a
time for Governor to take the decision to invite the leader of the majority party to form the Government but it could not be happened in the lack of majority party or any political group who by consensus has support of 213 members in the House. In this situation, Governor, Romesh Bhandari took the decision of the re-imposition of President’s Rule. His decision was based on certain Constitutional points as:

- In Indian Constitution, any provisions in law to continue Presidential Rule beyond one year (which is expiring) is under Article 356(5) of the Constitution and such provision is not applicable because the Government has been able to hold elections and the election results have already been declared, therefore, Article-356 (5) of the Constitution does not apply.

So, a fresh proclamation under Article 356 on the expiry of the earlier proclamation would depend clearly on an assessment of the Governor that a situation has arisen as a result of present composition of the new Assembly in which he was of the opinion that the Government of the state could not be carried on in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution. The Governor reported to that effect to the President. Then it would not be unconstitutional.\(^\text{38}\)

However, on 16\(^{th}\) October around 7:00 pm it was announced that the Cabinet had approved the re-promulgation of President’s Rule. But the negative point for Governor was that he was criticized by BJP and Congress as well because Congress Committee President of Uttar Pradesh said that from the day one, both BJP and “United Front” (UF) did not want that Congress-BSP Government would be formed. On other side, BJP reacted violently against the proclamation of President’s Rule in UP.\(^\text{39}\) Leaders of the party took to the streets. Kalyan Singh and Kalraj Mishra marched to the Raj Bhavan to handover a Memorandum to the Governor. Kalraj Mishra announced the launching of a weeklong agitation against the Governor
culminating in a rally on October 25th and Kalyan Singh stated as "the murder of democracy." But in reality such a proclamation was made by the President, Shankar Dayal Sharma on the advice of Council of Ministers.40

Thus, the 1996 election was a different phenomenon when BSP-Congress alliance summed up a phase of Mandal politics. This phase was characterized with the BSP’s game plan of attracting the Brahmins; and absence of focus on the issues of the Dalits and exclusive concentration on Mulayam Singh much more than the BJP. As far as social base was concerned, Yadavs were with Mulayam and Muslims had not moved away from him. He was thinking to opt Janata Dal. While United Front was raising farmer’s issues, BSP was trying to woo upper castes while BJP had the option to back to the Mandir Plank.41

**BSP-BJP Coalition Government in Uttar Pradesh: 1997**

This was the period of be-imposition of President’s Rule in UP after 1996 Hung-Assembly, when another chapter of BSP’s coalition politics started again with BJP in 1997. This time it was ‘Post-electoral alliance’ preceded by ‘Pre- electoral alliance’ with Congress during 1996, UP Assembly elections. In the context of Assembly elections held in 1996 finally reached at its purpose (government formation) in March, 1997. It means 1996 election was followed by the continuation of President’s Rule, which was imposed on the state in October 1995, because political parties could not form a government following a divide electoral verdict. Though BJP emerged as the largest party in the Assembly elections, yet it could not easily find coalition parties to govern with. After six months, the BJP arrived at an agreement with BSP.42

On 18th March, 1997 it was reported that an agreement had been reached between the BSP and BJP but with a new formula of administration that was “Power
"Sharing Arrangement". On 19th March both BSP and BJP leaders held a Joint Press Conference in Delhi. The uniqueness of such a new strategy was that each partner (party) of coalition would form its own government with its own leader for six months. And it was BSP which was to form the government under the Chief Ministership of Mayawati for first six months according to this arrangement, and to be followed by six months tenure under Kalyan Singh. But the condition was put before BSP by BJP that the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly would be the BJP’s nominee. This point became controversial when Kanshi Ram also demanded for the same but at last Kanshi Ram dropped this demand from his part. With this new unique formula the Coalition Government of BSP-BJP was to be formed on 19th March, 1997 and both parties announced that the government would be of coalition and have representation of both parties. Though the date was decided to the government formation by both parties, yet the question arises here that on what grounds the two opposite parties came closer and made it final to be aligned. So, the two parties’ arguments regarding the coalition formation were:

- As for as BSP’s argument is concerned, it stated that it was expecting that Congress would be able to prevail upon the United Front (UF) to support a government led by her, particularly, Congress was supporting a government led by UF at the centre. And Congress President Sitaram Kesari had withdrawn support from the Deve Gowda government.

- Another point was that both BSP and BJP did not wish that President Rule should continue;

- And MLAs of both parties did not want to the re-election in UP;
• Besides BSP’s important argument was that President’s Rule would be most advantageous to the SP, particularly, which could never be acceptable to BSP as being rival party.

So, Mayawati thought these reasons may be appropriate in aligning with BJP as both parties had a common compassion to come together. Being a two major parties coalition, it was obvious that BJP had also seen few similarities with BSP about the benefits of alignment:

BJP wanted power at any cost and BJP was not able to split the sufficient number of MLAs even after the five months after Assembly elections. “Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh” (RSS) stated that Dalits support to BJP is essential to come into power. Due to these reasons, some possibility was seen by the both parties to form a government in UP by coming closer. Kalyan Singh handed over a hand written letter signed jointly by him and Mayawati to the Governor. Both parties as combined had majority in the House (Legislative Assembly) to form the government, such as:

• **Bharatiya Janata Party - 174 MLAs with**, 02 MLAs of Samata Party and 06 MLAs of Independents.

• **Bahujan Samaj Party - 67 MLAs**

In this way the total strength of both parties was 249 in 425 member’s Assembly.

Table No. 13: Parties and Number of MLAs in BSP-BJP Coalition in UP 1997

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Parties</th>
<th>MLAs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bharatiya Janata Party</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samata Party (with BJP)</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents (with BJP)</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahujan Samaj Party (on other side)</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With BSP- BJP claim of government formation the date of ‘swearing in ceremony’ was decided to be on 21st March, 1997 which was arranged in K.D. Babu Stadium in afternoon. And 26th March was the date when Cabinet Ministers took the oath of the office, individually and Ministers of States could be asked to take oath in a group of 8 or 10. But due to objection by some Ministers it was decided to take oath individually. Another clash started regarding the distribution of portfolios as each party wanted to have the more important portfolios. An understanding was reached between two parties that once the change-over took place, it would remain as they were. During this distribution, Mayawati kept the major portfolios:

- General administration
- Home
- Election
- Finance
- Industrial development
- Civil Aviation
- Appointments
- Energy
- Information
- Excise
- Health
- Education
- Irrigation

With the distribution of Portfolios the functioning of Coalition Government started under the Chief-Ministership of Mayawati on the basis of ‘Power Sharing Formula.’
Mayawati Tenure: As a Period of Pro-Dalit Policies and Programmes:

Being the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh, she had given the vast administrative powers. She recognized her legitimate power and used it firstly in giving “Swabhiman” (self-respect) to the Dalits that could be achieved by eulogizing Dr. B.R. Ambedkar in the form of constructing Ambedkar Parks, Ambedkar Villages and Statues etc. Popularizing Dr. Ambedkar was not new, Kanshi Ram has also popularized the heroes and social reformers of different Dalit castes; and Mayawati, a close associate of Kanshi Ram, when became the C.M. she created Ambedkar village, Buddha Park and Ravidas Ghats etc.

So, Mayawati’s main priority at this time was to complete the “Ambedkar Udyan” the park which was started during the first Chief Ministership of Mayawati in 1995 and it was remained incomplete after her resignation then. And funds were also not provided during President’s Rule for this project which cost touched a level of over Rs. 100 crores. Funds were embarked through the Contingency Fund. When an officer from Finance Department made some queries, he was transferred. And two BJP leaders: Kalraj Mishra was handling PWD and Lalji Tondon was in charge of Urban Development, both cooperated on this project. Only these two BJP leaders were responsible for the handling money and expenditure. This point became positive for Mayawati because during Kalyan Singh tenure a case was registered against Mayawati for such a huge expenditure then Mayawati demanded a CBI probe as she was not directly given any approval on this project but it was done through the leaders of BJP itself. Besides this Park, a number of Ambedkar statues were erected throughout the state.

But the important point of these Pro-Dalit acts of Mayawati was its being controversial and a weakening point for BSP- BJP Alliance. As on one side BSP was
strengthening its support base among Dalits but on other side BJP was losing the support of upper-castes.

- Transfers and postings of officers also became an issue between these two partners as transfers were made in three categories: transfer of those officers belonging to the SCs and were loyal to Mayawati and officers who were known to be supporters of Mulayam Singh Yadav therefore, could not be trusted. And those who were prepared to pay a price for their posts.

- The implementation of SC /ST Act was another factor in the survival of BSP-BJP alliance. Having certain very harsh provisions, it was alleged by upper castes that this Act was being falsely implicated against them and they are being prosecuted under the very rigid provisions of the Act.45

This issue was used by Mayawati as a ground to withdraw its support from the coalition after completing its tenure. She said that her partners in the BJP were not cooperating with her party’s attempt to implement a law (Dalit Act) which aimed at prevention of atrocities against those belonging to the lower castes.46

**BJP Perceived BSP as a Threat:** All the pro Dalit policies of BSP created a fear among BJP leaders regarding the BJP image, its vote bank weakening and transfer of power to BJP by Mayawati. This was Kalyan Singh who perceived that BJP image taken a severe beating as its traditional vote bank had become disillusioned, it leading the party towards disintegration and alliance had only benefitted to BSP. Such a perception by Kalyan Singh was not baseless; this fear was created in him as he had doubt that BSP would not transfer Chief Ministership to him easily which proved to be true later on.

- Change of Speaker with the change in the Chief Ministership also became a ground in BSP-BJP alliance.
Another condition put before BJP by BSP was that assurance to the continuity of BSP policies and programs after BJP took over the power. This issue divided the BJP’s view; a section of BJP was ready for this accommodation while another was opposed to it. In spite of the division of view on this issue BJP made public announcement regarding the continuity of these programs and policies and for not transferring any officers except in respect of necessary function and reasons.

On Speaker’s issue, Mayawati made it clear her points for this demand. Due to the danger regarding the split in MLAs of her party and other parties by BJP leader Kalyan Singh after being Chief Minister; this demand was made by Mayawati. But on this issue BJP leader L.K Advani, Atal Behari Vajpayee in an intensive discussion with Kanshi Ram and Mayawati gave full assurance to Kanshi Ram that BJP would not try to break the BSP. Meantime when the BSP was asking for this demand, the then Speaker of the assembly Kesari Nath Tripathi said that he would not resign under any circumstances. But this issue was solved with discussion. And this was Rajnath Singh, UP President of the BJP stated that the coalition would have to continue as in the event it breaks it would mean President’s Rule.

The result of all these assurances made by BJP was that Mayawati then started to prepare herself for the changeover. It was the date on 20th September, 1997 when governor was handed over a letter of resignation by Mayawati and with a statement as Kalyan Singh would be the new Chief Minister. Then swearing in ceremony was organized in K.D. Babu Stadium on 21st September, 1997 and Kalyan Singh taken over the power.
Kalyan Singh’s Tenure: A Period in Response to Mayawati's Acts:

As for as Kalyan Singh taken over power in September 1997, he utilized his period of power against the BSP, such as: one of the first acts of the new government was to issue a Government Order popularly known as ‘Go’, wherein all district authorities were directed to see that there was no abuse of SC/ST Act 1989. The Go was issued the day after Kalyan Singh was sworn in namely on 22nd September, 1997. It stated that state Government was committed to stop crime against the members of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. At the same time it was intention of the state government to ensure that the provisions of SC/ST Act are not misused. The provision of this act was very severe. Punishment is required to be quick through Special Courts. It was the statement of Kalyan Singh that what she had been doing was arbitrary and loaded in favor of the SC/ST castes.

In this way, in just over two weeks since Kalyan Singh took over, the relations had soured to an extent that differences appeared to have become irreconcilable. Kanshi Ram had a different perception than Mayawati, he did not want any break in the coalition. On 29th September, 1997 he made a statement in Bangalore that the BJP government would continue for six months. He realized that he could become a political outcaste if he was seen to have broken the alliance with the BJP. On other hand Kalyan Singh was not prepared to compromise on any cost, he had to restore the image of the BJP while Mayawati seen the continuity of coalition as a major problem for herself as she was being charged with corruption. Secondly, the Muslim MLAs were feeling shaky as the alliance with the BJP could mean that they would not win again. Both BJP and SP were waiting for BSP MLAs to break away.
Breakup of Alliance:

All these clashes resulted into the breakup of BSP-BJP alliance 1997 with Mayawati’s statement that she had consulted with Kanshi Ram to withdraw support and wanted the dissolution of the Assembly but the view at central level was that dissolution and promulgation of President’s Rule was not possible. According to ‘Bomai’ judgment, the government in power would have to be given a chance to prove its majority on the floor of the House. Dissolution also could only be done by Parliament and till then the Assembly would have to be kept in suspended animation, if the government failed to secure a vote of confidence. There was another school of thought also which argued that the Bomai judgment did not apply in this case as it was a coalition which is in power, not a single party. If a coalition broke, the government in power had no right to claim to seek a vote of confidence, as this would be only encouraging horse-trading. But on 19th October, 1997 Mayawati said that they would be prepared for giving an opportunity to Kalyan Singh for a floor test. And she handed over a letter to the governor stating that she was withdrawing support from the BJP. She listed out all reasons which had led her and her party to having to take this decision:

- The BJP had violated all the assurances given to the BSP.
- Kalyan Singh government had done everything to hit at Mayawati personally and to destroy BSP. However, the 28 days old Coalition Government of BSP-BJP came to an end on 19th October, 1997. The fall of this coalition was due to two highly volatile leaderships whose mutual antagonism did not characterized with an understanding and to have co-ordination essential for the success of coalition model in the state. Under these circumstances she demanded that the Legislative
Assembly should be dissolved and the President’s Rule be imposed. So, due to the withdrawal of support by Mayawati, Kalyan Singh being the C.M. of UP was given the time to prove his majority on the floor of the House, and for that purpose convene a session of the Assembly on 21st October, 1997. The Vote of Confidence was to take place at 12 noon. Till then the press had only reported that 19 MLAs from the Congress had formed a new group. While SP was very certain that no one would break from their side. At 12 o’clock Assembly was convened but with a very undisciplined and disordered manner which could be seen as many of the MLAs were bleeding. In this session, Mayawati, Pramod Tiwari, Dhani Ram Verma and others demanded that the President’s Rule be imposed. As a Governor, Romesh Bhandari recommended imposition of President’s Rule more on ethical and moral grounds than a breakdown of Constitutional machinery.

But the main point, related to this matter of Vote of Confidence, was the splitting of MLAs from other parties by Kalyan Singh. To survive politically in power Kalyan Singh made defections as:

- 22 MLAs defected from the Congress (I). They had split into two phases: the first group of 19 was recognized by the Speaker on the 20th evening, and another three MLAs had gone later.
- Three MLAs were split from Janata Dal
- In the Assembly itself, some BSP MLAs had gone over to the BJP side.

The Speaker announced that 222 MLAs had voted in favor of the BJP. And the decision of Speaker could only be challenged in a Court of law. Later on it was known that 12 BSP MLAs had voted for the BJP and one MLA abstained. If 12 BSP MLAs who had defected in clear violation of the Anti defection law, had adhered to the party whip, the Kalyan Singh government would have lost the Vote of
Confidence. Thus, Kalyan Singh Government survived but at the cost of the morality of politics.

Though defections were made by Kalyan Singh government and it survived too, yet controversy raised as both Congress and BSP maintained that these were illegal defections and attracted the provisions of the ‘Anti-Defection laws’ and all the defecting members should be disqualified. But the main point was that as for as Congress (I) MLAs were concerned, there were two points:

- The defections were not in conformity with the Constitution of the Congress (I). There should have been a meeting of Congress (I) party in accordance with the prescribed procedure, a split could have taken place. Thereafter alone it would be considered as a split.

- Whereas 19 MLAs had announced the formation of the “Loktantrik Congress Party” and they exceeded one third of the total strength, the other three who had joined later had to be viewed as another defections.

And as for as BSP was concerned, it had strength of 67 MLAs and 12 had defected, and supported the BJP in the Vote of Confidence, and later also became members of the Council of Ministers. Here, the members were well short of the 23 required to make one third of the strength of the BSP legislators. But Speaker was contending that the defection is ongoing process. Only 12 however, were visible, while the remaining 11 remained invisible. Even then the facade was kept up that the defections were within the purview of the anti-defection law. According to law, an official decision in regard to defections vests with the Speaker. If UP Assembly Speaker would disqualify 12 BSP MLAs, the BJP government would collapse. But Speaker was delaying decision and taking recourse to various provisions and flexibilities that these are under the law. And he had held that all the defections were
valid. Though the purpose of the Anti Defections Act-1985 was to end the trend of defections in our polity but state Assembly’s Speaker gave a new interpretation of the Act on the status of the 12 BSP MLAs who voted with the BSP on October 21st, 1997 to save the Kalyan Singh Government. However, such type of opportunistic defections by elected members have represented the worst form of political immorality. Thus, Kalyan Singh government had survived in spite of the best efforts of the Congress and the BSP to keep their members together.

On 26th October, 1997 Chief Minister, Kalyan Singh gave the governor a list of 760 MLAs who were to be made ministers. He included:

- all the 22 defectors from the Congress
- all the 12 BSP defectors
- all the 3 Janata Dal
- one from Samata Party
- Two independents & rest from the BJP

And Governor approved the list and swearing was to take place at 4 pm. Among three Ministers Raja Bhaiya was one of them who had a long record and having a history sheeter with No -A-163, and was to be sworn as a Cabinet Minister. The total strength of the UP Council of Ministers stood at 93, while normal strength of Ministry in UP has been between 40 and 50. For e.g. 43 Ministers sworn in with Mayawati as a Chief Minister, 43 were sworn in as replacement or up-gradation, another 70 were sworn in on the 27th October. This made a total of 158 Ministers while in terms of cost, it was estimated that the new Cabinet would entail an annual liability of Rs. 100 crores on the state budget. But simmering discontent amongst those who had defected and supported the Kalyan Singh government started from the day that the Council of Ministers was expanded on 27th October, 1997 as most were
unhappy with their portfolios. Again these happenings led to the instability in UP power politics or instability of the government in UP. As it was the day of 12th December 1997, it was came to know that some efforts were being made to form another government. But on 21st February, 1998 the leaders of Loktantrik Congress informed Romesh Bhandari, then governor of UP about their decision to withdraw support from the BJP government in the state and stated their claim to form government with the support of other parties: Samajwadi Party, BSP and Congress; and these parties also informed to support the leader, Jagdambika Pal of the Loktantrik Congress to form government. Jagdambika Pal had been elected as MLA on the ticket of Congress (I) group, which was breaking group of Congress. He fought election separately against the parent party in 1996 Assembly elections. He along with other member of Congress (T) group had merged with the Congress (I) when N.D. Tewari had been re-admitted into the Congress Party. Jagdambika Pal had the majority of the Loktantrik Congress and also the entire Janata Dal break way group. And he had letter of support from other parties with him. The entire group reached to Raj Bhavan with the 10 members from Loktantrik Congress making a 12. Mayawati herself came over to Raj Bhavan and she not only given her willingness to support Jagdambika Pal in writing, but wished to ensure that there should be no doubt in respect of her intentions while Mulayam Singh Yadav also telephoned the governor and said that his party had given a letter of support and he would be sending Ahmad Hassan to be personally present to show the support of the to the SP to the group led by Jagdambika Pal. And on the part of Congress, top Congress leaders telephoned from Delhi for their support to Jagdambika Pal and CPM, CPS were also supporting Jagdambika Pal.
Kalyan Singh arrived in Raj Bhavan accompanied the BJP president, Raj Nath Singh and five or six of his Cabinet colleagues from the BJP, Chaudhary Narendra Singh of the break way BSP group Vivek Singh of Loktantrik Congress. They had already sent a telegram to the president stating that Kalyan Singh should be given the opportunity to test his strength on the floor of the House. Both Vivek Singh and Virendra Singh wanted to meet the governor. Both ministers told that they were joining Jagdambika Pal. Vivek Singh said that even though Kalyan Singh had offered to elevate him to the Cabinet rank, yet he would prefer to leave the Kalyan Singh government. But at 7 p.m. governor was informed that the President had written a letter to the Prime Minister expressing the view that Kalyan Singh be given the opportunity of verifying his assembly strength through a test on the floor of the House. But the main challenge was before the governor was that he should invite Jagdambika Pal to form the Government or to give an opportunity to Kalyan Singh to prove his majority again on the floor of House, as stated by the President. In this hard situation governor, Romesh Bhandari was in responsibility to take a decision as under Article 163-164 of the Constitution. Provision under this Article empowers Governor under his exclusive jurisdiction. The choice of the Chief Minister falls within the exclusive power of the Governor and it has been the consistent view of the various High Court as well as Honourable Supreme Court that the court in exercise of its jurisdiction under Article- 226 of the Constitution of India cannot generally interfere with the discretionary power of the Governor. And before taking a decision, Governor, Romesh Bhandari consulted lawyers who had been dealing with Constitutional matters:

- R.N. Trivedi — a former Advocate General &
- S.C. Mishra — President of Allahabad Bar Association.
And it was the view of both lawyers that the discretion was entirely that of Governor, so he must act as he thinks fit and the decision that he would take, cannot be questioned. Thus, in keeping view the provisions of the Constitution and in consultation with lawyers, Governor, Romesh Bhandari took the final decision and sent a letter to Kalyan Singh that he was being dismissed. And invited Jagdamlaika Pal to form a Government and asked him to prove his majority on 24th February, 1998. Jagdambika Pal gave to the Governor a list of 18 members to be sworn in, 17 were former Ministers of Kalyan Singh Government and one was from BKKP. And oath taking ceremony was arranged at very short notice and Jagdambika Pal taken the oath for Chief Minister. However, Kalyan Singh government was dismissed and Jagdambika Pal was sworn in as the Chief Minister. While the next day, most of the MLAs of Loktantrik Congress, led by Naresh Agrawal, and switched their support back to the BJP. A division Bench of the UP High Court restored the Kalyan Singh Government, in its judgement on 21st February, 1998. It stayed the dismissal order of the Kalyan Singh Government and ordered the status quo ante. But this judgment was challenged in the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court in its judgment, on 24th February, 1998 directed the Speaker of Legislative Assembly to hold a “Composite Floor Test” in the assembly. Until the declaration of the result of the floor test in, both Kalyan Singh and Jagdambika Pal remained the Chief Ministers. The result of the floor test held on 26th February, 1998.

But for this a special session of the Uttar Pradesh assembly be summoned for on 26 February, 1998 to have a composite floor test between the contending parties in order to see which out of the two claimants of Chief Ministership has a majority in the House and processing in the Assembly would be peaceful. Result of the composite test would be announced by the Speaker faithfully. And in the interregnum no major
decisions would be made by the functioning government except attending to routine matter. The Supreme Court judgment, while not accepting the legality of the Kalyan Singh with this judgment, a u turn was made by the defectors. Such as: Naresh Aggarwal was back with Kalyan Singh while it was the statement of Vivek Singh that governor had offered him Rs 1 crore to join Jagdambika Pal. In this way, Kalyan Singh had brought back all his defecting ministers. And this was Atal Bihari Vajpaye who went to Rashtrapati Bhavan and demanded the Governor’s dismissal and delegation from supporting parties make similar demands. But former Prime Minister, Chandra Shekhar favored the decision of the governor and said that ‘preservation of democracy’ was not confirmed to merely safeguard the individual position of a Chief Minister, it had wider implications including the free and fair elections and civilized behaviour by the people in authority.

In response to such demand, governor write a letter to the Prime Minister, requesting him that he should be given an opportunity to explain his action. But he never received a reply. In press it was published that the Cabinet had considered the letter and had decided that the new government could take a decision on it. The major point of all these happenings was that the Governor, Romesh Bhandari was being criticized for his decision and was demanded for his resignation in response to his criticism. Governor’s points were:

- This main concern was to ensure political stability in the state, and not to create any situation of a fresh polls in UP in the delay of taking decision, law and order problem could be created.

So, he has only two options either to give time to Kalyan Singh government to swear in a new government. So, Governor decided to call Jagdambika Pal to form a new government because of certain factors:
• Kalyan Singh government was a Coalition Government comprised the BJP and Samata Party with the support of defectors from the Congress (1), the BSP and the Janata Dal.

• Out of 22 MLAs that had joined the Kalyan Singh government, 15 were physically presented in Raj Bhavan in addition, Raja Ram Pandey and Ram Pal Rajvanshi of the break way Janata Dal had also teamed up with Jagdambika Pal. 17 Ministers of Kalyan Singh government had broken away from him and were physically present. So, from a total strength of 222 which Kalyan Singh government enjoyed, 17 had defected bringing the strength down to 205 at the maximum. Kalyan Singh was clearly in Minority.

Thus, the voting took place on 26th February, 1998 Kalyan Singh government secured 225 votes as opposed to 196 Jagdambika Pal governor reported this matter to the President as earlier strength of BJP was 222, it had gone up by more MLAs of as more MLAs of BSP had been over by the BJP sometimes in December, 1997. These Ministers became the great beneficiaries as by voting for Kalyan Singh government, they ensured that they would become Ministers.57

However, Uttar Pradesh political system during 1990s decade had been of political instability and President’s Rule for several times. Different governments were formed under different leaderships of distinct parties by itself or in an agreement with other parties.

Table No. 14: Tenure of Governments in Uttar Pradesh in the 1990s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governments</th>
<th>Political Party</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kalyan Singh</td>
<td>BJP</td>
<td>June 24 to December 4, 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s Rule</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>December 4, 1992 to June 3, 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulayam Singh</td>
<td>SP-BSP</td>
<td>June 4, 1993 to June 3, 1995</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Again, it was the 2002 Assembly election in Uttar Pradesh, when BJP provided its support to Bahujan Samaj Party (BSP). The 2002 assembly elections were the first since 1991 when BJP did not win a plurality of the assembly seats. Though “Samajwadi Party” (SP) won the plurality of seats, yet it could not form a government due to the opposition of both the BJP and the BSP. This situation brought the President’s Rule in Uttar Pradesh which was lifted only when both parties: BJP and BSP resolved to form a Coalition Government.\(^5\) Election result of 2002 assembly election created a situation of uncertainty in UP’s political system due to the lack of majority party. In this election of Uttar Pradesh, the winner of the most seats was the provincial, Mandal, OBC-based ‘Samajwadi Party.’ And the runner up was its enemy, the provincial Mandal leaning, Dalit-based ‘Bahujan Samaj Party’. While BJP came third even conversion from Mandir to Mandal.\(^6\) The lack of majority party produced ‘Hung Assembly’ in February, 2002 as in the 1996 elections. The result show that the BJP has experienced a sharp decline reaching a low of only 88 seats compared to 174 in 1996 elections. The Samajwadi Party (SP) and Bahujan Samaj Party (BSP) have improved considerably on their earlier performance, means, SP obtained 147 seats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayawati</td>
<td>BJP-BSP</td>
<td>June 3, 1995 to October 17, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s Rule</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>October 18, 1995 to October 17, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s Rule</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>October 17, 1996 to March 21, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayawati</td>
<td>BJP-BSP</td>
<td>March 21, 1997 to September 20, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalyan Singh</td>
<td>BJP</td>
<td>September 21, 1997 to February 21, 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalyan Singh</td>
<td>BJP</td>
<td>February 22, 1997 to November 12, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.P. Gupta</td>
<td>BJP</td>
<td>November 12, 1999 to October 28, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajnath Singh</td>
<td>BJP</td>
<td>October 29, 2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and BSP 97 compared to 110 and 67 seats earlier whereas the Congress Party dropped
to only 26 seats as compared to 33 in the 1996 Assembly elections.

Table No. 15: Number of Seats Won by Major Political Parties in UP 2002 Assembly Elections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Parties</th>
<th>No. of Seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samajwadi Party</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahujan Samaj Party</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bharatiya Janata Party</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congress</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


February 2002 Assembly elections in Uttar Pradesh gave a blow to the BJP’s
ambitions to consolidate its position as the only alternative to the Congress in national
politics. However, an attempt was made to ensure that Mulayam Singh Yadav’s SP
would not be able to form the next government in the state, despite emerging as the
single – largest party in the Assembly. With this intention, party leaders were
conducting negotiations with Mayawati, the BSP leader. This negotiation led to the
both parties understanding on power sharing in the state. This time it was agreed that
Mayawati would head a Coalition Government with the BJP and smaller groups and
individuals as junior partners. But this arrangement with BSP was not acceptable to
the leaders of the BJP in UP including Rajnath Singh, whose argument was that the
power sharing alliance with a Dalit based party would alienate many of the BJP’s
supporters – the upper castes. But these leaders had to support BSP because of the
BJP’s central leadership. But soon contradictions started between both parties which
resulted into the decision of Mayawati government to recommend dissolution of the
assembly and the holding of fresh election. After the BJP-BSP alliance broke, on
August, 28 UP governor Vishnu Kant Shastri asked Mulayam Singh Yadav to present
him with a list of MLAs who would support his claim to become Chief Minister. However, SP presented a list of 205 out of 405 MLAs, including MLAs belonging to the Congress, the RLD, Kalyan Singh RKP and small parties. In fact, it also included 14 BSP MLAs. Thus, Mulayam Singh Yadav sworn as Chief Minister for the third time.62

Thus, it can be said that BSP, Bahujan Samaj Party of downtrodden and oppressed section of society started its journey as a social movement and gradually transformed into a political one, completely in 1984 with the origin of BSP. Since then it has gone through various phases of its progress as:

- The phase of 'Isolation'- the period of 1984 to 1993 when BSP had a distinguished character as a Dalit Party but more as a social movement of the lower section of society which throughout this period remained untouched with another political party by adopting isolation policy with a hostile attitude towards upper castes parties termed them as 'manuwadi'. It showed BSP’s opposition to Hindutva and caste based atrocities specially Congress. As Kanshi Ram in his treatise he termed the period in which SCs elite attached with Congress Party as ‘Chamcha Age’ as these elites are selling their interests of their community for personal advancement, said them as Chamar and put a target to form a social alliance of Dalits and backward castes to fight against their common enemy upper-castes. Mobilize the backward caste for its political motive to achieve political power, Kanshi Ram and Mayawati both campaign through 80s demanding the implementation of the Mandal Commission report for which a series of demonstrations and meeting were organized by both of them across North India agitating for the reservation in higher education and government jobs recommended by Mandal Commission.
Mayawati and Kanshi Ram’s agitation was for the welfare of Backward Castes was because this community is a core component of the Bahujan Samaj. With attempts to won the backwards, BSP leaders Kanshi Ram and Mayawati also made efforts to mobilize Muslim community by holding various meetings in villages of North India termed as “Bhaichara Banao Programmes”. Its great examples is of 15th December, 1987 meeting held in Delhi’s Jama Masjid where Mayawati asked Muslims to join Dalits and Backward Castes alliance in a an electoral fight against the upper castes dominated politics by whom 2% Muslims are given government jobs.

So, it was the general election of 1989 which had given a ground to both leaders to test their efforts of making an alliance of Dalits, Backwards, and Muslims minorities in North India, when BSP got a little but a significant success by winning 3 seats in Parliament Bijnore, Azamgarh and Phillaur in Punjab. While in UP Assembly elections held in the same year 13 seats were won by BSP.

- The successful efforts in the form of seats winning both in Parliament and U.P Assembly shows the BSP’s strength and period of isolation politics, where it alone without a parties support made an entry into the power politics era.

- A share that became the process of politicization which eventually mobilized various marginalized weaker section of society and brought them to the political arena. With this process every single social group became politicized giving birth to various political parties as the rise of ‘Bahujan Samaj Party’ (BSP) and ‘Samajwadi Party’ (SP) in UP in 1990s but ‘exclusivist’ in nature because of their confined electoral support to particular caste groups, particularly in 1990s.
Second phase started on in 1990s. UP has seen a transformation in its political scene since 1990s, in the form of huge fragmentation of political parties. The main reason may be said is of 'identity politics' which gave a birth to the number of identity-based political parties stood respective sections of society. And it has also created instability in political system. In this fragmented scenario ‘Bahujan Samaj Party (BSP)’ has emerged as a party of and Bahujan and now claimed or redefining itself as the party of ‘Sarvajan’ (a party of all sections of society). And it is trying to woo the votes of upper castes also which was anti to the upper castes earlier.

In this competitive electoral scenario, the main aim of each and every party is to come into the main stream of politics i.e. by acquiring and maintaining power. This power politics has forced the parties to adopt various electoral strategies. Forming their coalition or alliances is one of the strategies which was used by BSP when for the first time it came into coalition with Samajwadi Party in 1993.65

With their coalition a Bahujan phase started in UP that was an electoral alliance between the Bahujan Samaj Party and Samajwadi Party to the formation of Mulayam Singh Yadav led government. But soon contradictions started between them because of the historic clash of their vote banks: Dalits and OBCs. The result of this electoral alliance came in the form of the end of their government. This type of electoral alliance cannot survive for a long term as the longevity of a political arrangement mostly depends upon the social coalitions also at grass root level that provide strength to the coalition. The only phenomena of a social coalition was lacked in BSP-SP electoral alliance in 1993.66

After Bahujan Phase the phase which was started in UP known as ‘Post-Bahujan Phase’ when BSP came into an alliance with upper caste parties as BJP, a manmowadi party, for time to time as in 1995, 1998, 2002 etc. BJP supported BSP in
1995 when SP-BSP coalition fell down and again in 1996 UP Assembly elections when both BJP-BSP came closer because of their respective interests and reasons. 1996 UP Assembly election scenario was different from earlier period as this time Mandal- Mandir issue was not highlighted to woo various sections of society. During this election the electoral fight was among three contenders: Mayawati, Mulayam and Kalyan Singh. But due to the absence of any majority party or any group acquired adequate number of legislatives to form a Coalition Government, BSP and BJP joined each other that was a “Post-electoral alliance” with a majority to form a government. The BJP motive behind joining BSP was to enlarge its base among the SCs. For this it was essential for BJP to woo the BSP and projected itself a Dalit friendly so that it could woo the Dalit, OBC and Muslim vote bank. BJP’s this strategy created internal rift among its leaders such as Advani did not ready to accept that the era of single party government is over and this strategy of alliance may be against the interest of the party. But BJP’s motive to broaden its electoral base required the support of other parties in the form of alliance formation to come into power which gave birth to the BSP-BJP alliance with the proposal of Chief Ministership of BSP. But alliance between enemies created various clashes; in fact such an alliance may be termed as "unnatural alliance" because the two opposite parties were aligned with distrust on each other.

A coalition analysis of party system is presented by Lawrence Dodd (1967) he has examined the durability of Coalition Government looking at the conditions which enable stable Coalition Government exist. In his view minimum winning coalitions are more likely to endure than either over or undersized groupings, he has suggested three intervening factors relating to the structure of party competition: the degree of cleavage conflict, fractionalization and stability. The degree of cleavage conflict
influences the extent to which parties are willing to bargain over coalition membership, while instability and fractionalization affect the certainty of information and hence the likelihood of a satisfactory (or Stable) outcome. In Indian context, Wyatt (1999:10-11) has used Dodd’s analysis to explain the failure of parties in Uttar Pradesh to form mutually beneficial electoral alliances and government coalitions. He suggested that parties appealing to antagonistic caste constituencies (the BSP and SP) have added constraints on their ability to form coalitions imposed, when these would be unpopular among their core support group.
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