



This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial-Share Alike 4.0 International (CC-BY-NC-SA 4.0) License, which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

The Coalition Politics System: Reviewing the Timeline and Validity of Joining the ‘Disjoints’

Mohd. Rameez Raza^a Gaurav Kr. Yadav^b

^aIntegral University, Lucknow, India ^bIntegral University, Lucknow, India

Received 18 May 2021; Accepted 01 June 2021; Published 09 June 2021

India, the biggest democracy in the world, is no longer a young one. With the passing of time, we have constantly turned mature and with this our political system has transformed itself too. As a developing nation, we chose the most volatile form of government – Democracy. With the question of forming a government, began the political innings of many political parties in India. Indian politics has gradually transformed from a Congress dominated, to a multi-party and then finally to a formal alliance system. With the passing of time, we have witnessed the rise and fall of parties, alliances and whatnot. However, with the maturing of democracy people started to understand their worth. Party worship was gradually replaced with manifesto voting. This led to the emergence of diverse political opinion, which ultimately saw no party getting the majority. This conundrum became the birth cause for the political system of the coalition. Ever since its inception, the coalition system has been questioned on grounds of morality and ethics. It has been painted as a game of ‘horse-trading’ and principles compromise for the lust of power.

This paper is an attempt at dissipating the questions being raised on the validity and ethics of coalition government. Further, it also analyses the growth of democratic fervour amongst the citizens of India, while trying to draw a parallel with the changing politics of India. It tries to draw a conclusion by arguing on the ethics, morality and validity of coalition as a system of government while quoting relevant developments in the field of politics. An attempt to draw a fair and square picture has been done by carefully analysing the recent political developments. In a nutshell, the social stigma attached to the coalition has been done away with.

Keywords: coalition, congress, democracy.

INTRODUCTION: UNDERSTANDING THE CONCEPT OF COALITION

Federalism is a means of sharing power among the free offices *viz.* Union and State Government in the alliance is also an instrument of power splitting. Logically, there should be both federalism and an alliance government and they should be complementing each other. Since the purpose of power-sharing is common in both. Alliance government always federally supports the system or the constitution, and sometimes gives more opportunities to small and regional parties for expression of ideas and democratic rights. In this way, it seems that the alliance government promotes democracy and representative administration. But there are some grey areas also, which coalition politics have; such as occasional coalitions, that are done after the announcement elections are made which gives rise to 'horse trading' for proving the majority on the floor of the house of representatives.

A coalition government is not a new or uncommon phenomenon; the word Coalition derived from the Latin word COALITION, which is an oral substance to grow and wish together, to grow up means to go or to grow up together.

Oxford Dictionary defines, coalition as;

“Coalition as an act of coalescing, or uniting into one body; a union of persons, states alliance. In the strictly political sense, the word coalition is used for an alliance or temporary union into a single government of distinct parties or members of distinct parties.”

Professor Ogg¹ defines, coalition as;

“As co-operative agreement under which distinct political parties, or at all events members of such parties form a government ministry.”

When there is an alliance government in the parliamentary system; that stands for, a government that has many political parties cooperating, to reduce the domination of one party within the alliance. The common cause of the system is when no party achieved a majority on

¹ Professor Ogg, 'Coalition Politics in India' in S. K. Khanna (eds.), *Contemporary Indian Politics* (Discovery Publishing House 1991) 82, 91

its own in the election. An alliance government can also be made in times of national difficulty or crisis, *for example* during the war, to give a high degree of deeming political government legitimacy. This gap reduces political conflict. In such times, the parties have formed all-party alliances (National Integration Government Grand Alliance). If the coalition collapses, the trust vote is held and a no-confidence motion is taken.²

A coalition government is made up of a variety of socio-political forces that are tightly bound together in order to emerge from political turbulence and storms that alter socio-political circumstances and compulsions.³ In a varied nation like India, a coalition government is constantly under strain. In every given circumstance, coalition partners always seek for disruption and never deny it until it breaks or develops. As a result, coalitions often remain on the tender hook until all partners are on board. No one joins the party until everyone has their fair portion of the cake.

A coalition government is created when a political coalition gains power, or when plurality (rather than majority) is not attained and multiple parties must work together to establish a government. The outcome of the Minister of State without Portfolio is one of the characteristics of this system of government.

The single biggest party, of course, the Indian National Congress, has dominated or governed extensively since independence in the world's biggest democracy. Since its inception in 1885, the Congress party has grown into the most organised and energetic force in India, with members hailing from all corners of the country. White people are not to be omitted in ordinary throughout India's liberation war, who confronted the British axe, not only the music, because the Congress party has suffered a lot of music. The British accounts for a large part of Congress's existence.

In his book *History of Modern India*, Bipin Chandra brilliantly states that while Hume intended to utilise Congress as a 'security valve', the early Congress leaders planned to utilise it as a

² Dr. Ranjan Rakesh, *Coalition Government and Politics in India* (Globus Press 2016) 17

³ Farooq Ahmad Malik & Bilal Ahmad Malik, 'Politics of Coalition in India' (2014) 2(1) *Journal of Power, Politics & Governance* 1, 8

'lightning conductor'.⁴ The British paid a high price for what was formerly known as the security valve. They accepted a loan from India under the pretence of commerce centuries ago, and it was returned to India with the tragic partition of 1947. While in power, the organized Congress Party had no rivals or competitors in India. The Congress benefited from Nehru's, Patel's, and Azad's brilliance, which lasted till 1977.

The alliance, contrary to popular opinion, is not a new notion in Indian politics. In Europe, political coalitionism is frequent and widespread. Indians don't have an unmatched quantity of experience with which to build a government. Following the implementation of the Government of India Act, 1935, undivided India saw its first taste of coalition government in 1937. Jinnah requested an alliance with the Congress and the Muslim League in Uttar Pradesh at the time, but the party had the majority, and the Congress refused. At the time, Mohamed Ali Jinnah withdrew his claim that the only honourable option in India for providing Muslims an equal share of power was a coalition, as shown in other states like the NWFP and Punjab, where the Congress partnered with other regional parties.

By 1947, it was evident that the Congress would have hereditary authority over the British in much of India, but not all. One of its historical assets was its ability to re-mould itself and absorb contemporary ideas and large segments of the populace. The key had allied in two Muslim-dominated territories in 1946, the North-West Frontier Province and the princely state of Kashmir. Since 1946, it has also shared power with the Muslim League in a tense system. However, since the programme was implemented with a strong centre in Congress, the residual powers that came with it were a key stumbling block in the discussions. It was a crucial component of the Nehru Report, commonly known as Universal Suffrage, published in 1928. Despite several adjustments, these aims were to be accomplished in the new political system after 1947, as well as in the implementation of the Constitution in 1950.⁵

A third component, a pledge in the Poona Pact of 1931 to reserve seats in the assembly for Oppressed Classes, Scheduled Castes, and Tribes, was largely disregarded historically. B.R.

⁴ Bipin Chandra, *History of Modern India* (first published 2001, Orient Black Swan 2009) 208

⁵ R.K. Sinha, *India 2025: Social Economic and Political Stability* (Shipra Publication, 2004)

Ambedkar, unlike the Muslim League, rejected the demand for a distinct electorate. With the emergence of a united body of voters, seats were reserved. Such initiatives enable the Congress to quickly regain support among Dalit voters who have been loyal to it for decades. As a result of the focus on plurality, minority voters were able to support the candidate. Because the government should reflect all sectors and portions of society's political, economic, and social goals, alliance governments have become a common element in the Indian political landscape, both at the centre and at the state level.

Prior to 2014, India saw seven elections in a row (1989–2009) in which no party gained a majority of seats in the Lok Sabha, resulting in minority administrations that were reliant on foreign backing. The Bhartiya Janata Party (BJP) earned a majority in the 2014 election and maintained the trend by wresting two states from the Congress in the October 2014 Assembly elections, Maharashtra and Haryana. The question is whether coalition politics is still important in our minds; pre-election alliances were important for the BJP in order to gain a majority in the Lok Sabha, a post-election alliance was necessary in Maharashtra, and coalition politics in the context of passing and building laws, as well as increasing the party's reach.

Coalition Fabric: Down the Timeline

The depth of India's viewpoint on coalition governance is shown by the legendary British Prime Minister, Benjamin Disraeli, who observed that the word 'coalition government' conjures up images of instability, hesitation, and other undesirable characteristics for the typical Indian.⁶ In India, the single-party dominance system has dominated for so long that any deviation from its drabness and symmetry is seen as an aberration embodying the image of instability.

The Congress, which dominated India for most of the past half-century, was more of a 'system' than a 'party' in the traditional sense. When its capacity was modified, and local and regional goals diminished, new parties started to emerge with a more efficient local drive. Congress was a Leviathan⁷, and no one could fill the void created by their electoral loss by a single political

⁶ Subhash C. Kashyap, *Coalition Govt, and Politics in India* (Uppal Publishing House, 1997) 55

⁷ Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan* (first published 1651, Penguin 1985) 29

party. India's political history has now entered a period of transformation. Because no other political group is capable of removing Congress on its own, a coalition government becomes a practical prerequisite. However, Lok Sabha Speaker P.A. Sangma; may hold diverse viewpoints, he said

"If I go by my personal experience, I led a coalition government of eight political parties in my state and I don't think it is good for the country. It is not healthy for the country but we can still wait and see."

A coalition government isn't always a terrible thing. We can't claim that it doesn't work, it has worked in a sophisticated nation like Italy for many years. Kerala has more than twenty-five years of experience with coalition government, and West Bengal had it as well, but there are two types of coalition governments: first, political parties that form alliances before elections, and second, what occurred in Bengal. Coalition building after an election; it works, and it can work. If it's referred to as an alliance after the election, it's a different story. It was difficult, but not impossible, to form a coalition following the election. If someone asks me to establish a coalition government, I would never acknowledge it, Sangma remarked. We're conducting a post-election alliance in India right now, so we'll have to wait and see. So, for the next several years, India will be a really exciting place to be. We have chosen a new experience in the country but we are forced into the situation we do not choose this type of situation.⁸

History and Development of Alliance: Post Independence Era

First Phase (1952-1967) - Congress Dominance

In India, the trend is now of political alliances. India has experienced alliance government in both states and at the Centre. However, it suggests more differentiated and complex sets of results. In India, the parliamentary system became concerned mainly because of the rise of the alliance government.⁹

⁸ Sudhir Kumar, 'Constitutional Position of Coalition Government in India' (2008) 69 The Indian Journal of Political Science 531

⁹ Rajender Chauhan Singh and Shallja Vasudeva, *Coalition government in India: Problem and Prospects* (Deep and Deep Publications, 2011) 9

For a significant amount of time after independence, Congress had the unwavering support of all parts of society. The Congress system refers to the single-party dominance of Jawaharlal Nehru during the period of his Prime Ministership. The first legislative general elections, conducted in 1952, are won by the Congress by a considerable majority. The CPI came in second to the Congress's 346. Nobody was surprised by the outcome of the first general election.

This election was predicted to be won by the Indian National Congress. He was known to have inherited the National Movement's heritage *via* the Congress party. In 1957 and 1962, the second and third general elections were conducted, respectively. By capturing three-fourths of the Lok Sabha seats, the Congress maintained its current position. Because the Congress served as both the governing and opposition parties in the first decade of elections, this era of Indian politics is known as the Congress Regime.

Second Phase (1967-1977) - Emergence of Multi-Party System and Alliance Government

The year 1967 is regarded as a landmark year in the political and electoral history of India. In the first three general elections, domination of the Congress Party was there throughout the whole country since 1952. This tendency wends to significant changes in the 1967 Election. Especially after the fourth general election, alliance politics begins to emerge as an alternative political system for the democratic government after non-Congress parties formed Alliance in many states.¹⁰

After 1967, a systematic shift that involved both social process and organizational expression this change is a breakdown of a one-party masterhood in the Centre and its substitution by the multi-party alliance. There was a change in Indian politics in 1967, which led to this change in the character of the party system getting in India. No single party claimed a complete majority at any level of political fabrication with the result that the intra-party model (tacit or implied) alliance was replaced by an inter-party (express or formal) alliance system. Congress vote fell

¹⁰ Majeed Akhter, *Coalition Politics and Power Sharing* (Manak Publication, 2000) 132

by about 5 per cent and while it had in the past 74 per cent seats in parliament, now it managed to win only 54 per cent.¹¹

1967 Election brought into picture the incidents of an alliance. Since there is not a single party get majority various non-Congress parties came together to form a joint legislative party (called *Samyukta Vidhayak Dal*), and they supported non-Congress Government. The SVD Government in Bihar United with SSP, BSP and with CPI on left and Jan Sangh on right. It was called 'Popular United Front' in Punjab.

Third Phase (1977 - continuing) - The Beginning of Formal Alliance

1977 elections mark the third phase and set the stage for the development of India's party system for the formation of the first alliance government at the Centre. In the 1977 general elections, Congress got only 154 seats they fielded candidates in 492 constituencies of the Lok Sabha assembly.

A. The Janata Party Experiment

The turning point in the history of alliance in India can be identified with the Janata Party rule (1977 to 1979), which brought for the first time, a non-Congress parties' power at the Centre. It was a very historical movement for the opposition parties who were able to provide and substitute for Congress at the national level. Janata Party wins 295 seats out of 540. The 1977 elections were described as political earthquakes in Indian politics. This experiment was the activator of the democratization process and strengthen the multi-party system in India. The leaders of the Janta Party declare it a victory of democracy. There were lots of contradiction in the Janta Party Alliance which comes as a warning to the existence itself. Morarji Desai becomes the prime minister but they cannot end the power struggle within the party, and the consequences of this the government led by Morarji Desai was lost his majority within 18 months. Another alliance government formed with the support of Congress in the leadership of Chaudhary Charan Singh. Later Congress withdrew the

¹¹ Subhendu Ranjan Raj, *Coalition politics in India: Dimensions of Federal Power Sharing* (Manak Publication, 2009) 89

support from the government, and Chaudhary Charan Singh Government could function only four months and the government could not face any parliamentary session.

B. Post - Janata Phase: Strengthening of the Alliance Government (1989-2014)

After undergoing the taste of alliance government during 1977–1979, single party domination reappeared during 1980–1989. But after the 9th General Election, the circumstances changed dramatically in 1989 in the facet of alliance government at the Centre. Since 1987, four alliance government has been formed by democratic theory. They are the following:

- National Front Government led by V.P. Singh (1989-1990).
- United Front Government led by H.D. Deve Gowda and I.K. Gujral (1996-1998).
- BJP led coalition government headed by Atal Bihari Vajpayee (1998-2004).
- United Progressive Alliance (2004-2009).
- United Progressive Alliance (2009-2014).

C. The National Front Alliance

Ninth general election witness alliance government in 1989 which rise of the head as the third force multiparty system. In the 1989 Election; verdict Congress was defeated by two emerging political force, BJP and National Front. All opposition parties came together to form the government under V.P. Singh in 1989. Left parties and BJP agreed to support the government from outside. But the national front lost its majority status due to internal conflict and could not achieve its goals.

D. The United Front Government

For the first time, the 1996 general election was a result of a parliament, which reflected national pluralism. There was not a single party that could claim a complete majority on the basis they form a government. BJP emerged as the largest party in the 11th Lok Sabha. After the collapse of BJP led government in 13 days the United front was in alliance with 13 parties TDP, DMK, JD, CPI (M), CPI, TMC, AGP, and SP were the key player. H.D. Deve Gowda becomes the new prime minister but in November Congress withdraw his support and Congress was said to be unhappy with the share in government and after this I.K. Gujral become PM.

E. BJP led Alliance Government

Both in the 12th and 13th Lok Sabha Elections results provided a chance to the largest political party for leadership. BJP to lead alliance government at the Centre; and advanced the BJP's position in 12th Lok Sabha election result and BJP's approach to regional parties strengthen ties between BJP and several regional parties. BJP formed National Democratic Alliance (NDA). NDA is a coalition of higher education political parties in India. AIADMK, Shiv Sena, TDA, Samta Party, were part of the NDA government. In 1988, Atal Bihari Vajpayee becomes PM with the support of some regional party but the government collapse within one year because AIADMK withdrew his support; due to many other regional parties supports after the 1999 Election, NDA won and Atal Bihari Vajpayee become Prime Minister for the third time for five years.

F. United Progressive Alliance (UPA)

The UPA alliance was formed with Centre-left political parties after the 2004 General Election, the largest member party of UPA was INC, and the INC National President Sonia Gandhi was also the chairperson of UPA. They formed the government in 2004 with the support of some left parties in the leadership of Dr Manmohan Singh.

Thus, the election between 1989-2009 led long phase for alliance politics in India. Since there are many alliances government or minority governments formed in the Centre with the support of other political parties however this was changed in 2014.

ALLIANCE GOVERNMENT: ANALYSING THE NATURE AND CHARACTERISTICS

An alliance may take two forms: a pre-election alliance or adjustment between parties, and a post-election union for political power sharing and government administration. In comparison to the latter, the former sort of cooperation offers a distinct benefit. A pre-election agreement gives parties a single platform to woo voters on the basis of a shared agenda.

As previously said, coalition governance works successfully in European nations such as France, Italy, and Portugal because the parties' cooperation is built on philosophy. Britain and America are the two countries that make up the alliance government. As the House of Commons' history illustrates, when neither party wins a clear majority in the general election, a single-party

minority government rules rather than an alliance. The twentieth century saw twenty-five general elections in the United Kingdom. Five failed to provide a decisive majority for any of the major parties. Because of the two-party system, each of these five occurrences resulted in a minority administration that was never aligned. These political parties are built on ideology, although other nations may have coalition governments, but they have failed because their socioeconomic structures vary from those of Western nations. In developing countries, alliance governments have no common programme, harmonisation of class structure, or social structure uniformity, *for example* instead, parties in alliance governments join hands to form a united front without any ideological foundation, and sometimes a formidable united front is drawn against some other political agitation or another political party.

No one political party controlled natural democratic growth after independence. The fact that the Congress Party was able to win with the emotional backing of the Indian people was due to its reconciliation.

The natural evolution of Indian democracy was impacted by Nehru's magnetic personality, and Indian democracy remained hostage to a leader, but the fall of Nehru's leadership and increased political awareness among the people has transformed the whole scene. Following Nehru's demise, a slew of new parties arose at the national, state, and regional levels. As a result, a party partnership is not an unthinkable occurrence.

Our social system naturally leads to an alliance government. Political development does not occur in a vacuum. They are all social organisations and structures that have resulted from the alliance. There is a political requirement in India today since no one party has a majority. As a result, we must be prepared for an alliance government, which is a normal occurrence in a plural society. Political socialisation is required in society. In certain places, negative voting dominates because political culture is the outcome of social culture, and our social culture is conflict, competitiveness, and factional warfare in society. As far as types of the alliance are concerned the government has seen two types of alliances in India.

A) Executive Alliance - Where the parties are joining the Cabinet.

B) Legislative Alliance - Where parties are supporting the government from the parliamentary floor without joining the Cabinet.

It is contingent on the perspectives and goals of the parties that enter the alliance. In contrast to a legislative alliance, an executive alliance requires a higher level of ideological and programmatic alignment; it invites parties to be part of the alliance despite its shiny contradictory ideologies.¹²

Understanding the Exo-Support System

Occasional political manoeuvres to establish a minority government have been unduly criticised as a villain in recent times as a factor culpable for bringing down five out of a total of six administrations since 1989 via the instrument of legislative support.¹³ At least one desired consequence has been seen by political observers when the party system shifts from a one-party effect to a multi-party structure. The federal aspects of the Indian political system were eroded by the regionalization of the party system, which was repressed under Congress' dominance. The experience of coalition and minority administrations has broadened the political vision and provided more room for leaders, broader categories of parties, and territory to participate in the governing process.

As a result, it is obvious that 'outside assistance' is a prevalent practise, even though it has shown to be an insufficient aspect of minority politics in India, as well as a proverbial trojan horse. However, the minority party's desire for power does not prevent them from running into it. Backseat driving undermines political processes and policies, hence it is ethically required that the outside party backing the prevailing government openly share responsibility. Even if this were not the case, no party, especially the Congress, can expect to be met with silence and inaction as a result of backing the minority administration. And why should this be the case?

The supporting party must share responsibility, but the non-ruling party should play an equally vital role in a legislative democracy that has been compromised as a monitor and indirect to the

¹² Subrata Kumar Mitra, *Governmental Instability in Indian States* (Ajanta Publications, 1978) 853

¹³ R. Venkatraman, *My Presidential Years* (Collins, 1993) 463

coalition government's omissions and acts of commission. Outside support has effectively decreased the overall opposition area, leaving an untouched opposition. The governing party now has the backing of the supporting party. As a result, our system is more political than ethical in nature.

ALLIANCE POLITICS: HOW ETHICAL?

With the recent win of the 'grand alliance' named '*Mahagathbandhan*' in Bihar, analysts said that alliance politics in India is not over yet. An alliance government is formed when there are two/more political parties that form an alliance that compromises their respective party policy and agenda. But what is good in alliance for people?

The alliance is made up of democratically elected representatives, but in itself, it is a way of usurping regardless of the decision of the voters. Alliance politics is just favouritism cash in on a political crisis. Creating alliances is full of challenges and each alliance member serves from insecurity about the alliance. Also, citizens cannot be certain when the alliance government gives way and will leave them in a state of political chaos.¹⁴ The alliance between national and regional parties has affected the relationship between the Union and the State. Where the regional parties pressurize and create pressure on alliance government on their state's problems in order to pay more attention to these and the Centre strives for regional balance interests in various states. This creates a lack of functioning in the federal polity in India. Nobody thought about the alliance when India gained independence. INC was the only ruling party. With the arrival of NDA in 1971, alliance politics in India received impulse. Now, with the regionalization and fragmentation of politics, it has aligned, an unstable settlement is formed in uncertain times; where there are no political allies or not enemy. It is not an alliance formed by interested parties. Parties are often in the alliance having differences with each other even on basic issues. This leads to a lot of political infiltration different from creating political compulsions for the parties to compromise their norms and values. Often, an alliance causes the ruling party or major parties to form an alliance with a party with a smaller number of seats. This empowers them to seize

¹⁴ Norman Schofield, 'Coalition Politics and Representative Democracy' (1997) 31 *European Journal of Political Research* 179

power again and goes against the electoral verdict change.¹⁵ If a lot of parties are controlling the fate of people, chaos and disorder will eventually result, because no party is in power. Multiple parties mean a multitude of ideas on every issue and a lack of understanding of policies or their execution. If there are more parties with one side to the case, no bill will be passed without lengthy debate, discussion and interruption. The arrival of the smooth functioning of Parliament leads to loss of alliance politics and it is not good for the country. Outside support is also important for the political quotient equation in the whole equation. If external support is withdrawn, governance will not be possible and political instability can affect the end result in administrative terms production.

As far as profit is concerned, these are as follows; biggest benefit ever in alliance government at the Centre is a proportional representation of regional political parties in Lok Sabha. This ensures that they have a voice in the ruling or proceedings. The alliance represents the will of a wider segment of the population thereby acting as one of the dominant tools to prevent the passage of undemocratic bills that are not in the interest of big democracy. If an alliance government is in power, that means voters have given a verdict that is mixed. The formation of an alliance government reflects the will of the people. This includes the governments of Canada, Australia and Finland. An alliance government provides a major breakthrough in the decision-making process for India's diverse communities.¹⁶ It is a government of the people, by the people and for the people. The votes of different communities, castes and religions should be divided in the name because India is truly one pluralistic society that values are multiformity. Since many alliance members do not share a common ideology, they engage in broader discourse concerning policy and decision making. It reflects the true essence of democracy. The representation of the aspirations of the people of every region and constituency, by the alliance of political parties rather than an effective majority. The voice of the minority is not cluttered and different states of India find a place within the national agenda.

The alliance political parties remain conscious of their public image and practice prudence within their policy-making, actions, and decisions. It shows an understanding of the reality of

¹⁵ P.R. Brass, 'Coalition Politics in North India' (1968) 62 *The American Political Science Review* 1174

¹⁶ Myron Weiner, *Party Politics in India: The Development of a Multi-party System* (Princeton University Press, 1957)

the contemporary political landscape. Political alliances mean the parties have to compromise to decide on acrimonious ideologies and approaches to make discretion that is more in the interest of people.¹⁷ When different regional parties gather to form a union, they are able to concentrate on making solution-oriented decisions and preventing the recurrence of political mistakes.

SITUATIONAL DEMOCRATIC SYSTEM: FAIR OR TAINTED?

“Democratic principles are the essence of the people’s will, which justifies the need for, and existence of, representative government, which is a symbol of rule in many constitutional democratic perspectives, or, in other words, the rule of the majority of the political community, including its various classes, groups, and sections, in many constitutional democratic perspectives. The term democracy refers to a kind of governance that is legally controlled, has a broad foundation, and is not focused on a single class, group, or coercion. In the absence of agreement, social consensus serves as the foundation for all democratic administration. Governments of the people, for the people, and by the people, as the saying goes. The people and representatives of the people who have been elected in an election propose this government.”

It creates a system for people to choose their representatives that is organised and related to recognised political parties based on their declared manifesto aims and numbered political roles. The majority, or majority party, governs, which is not a physically irreversible rule derived from majority rule at the moment of assent and ruling by popular advice and support.¹⁸ Representative governance ensures and provides:

- Control over government’s uncontrolled activities;
- Government responsibility and accountability to popular representative bodies; and,
- Accountability to public opinion and popular will.

¹⁷ Raj Hans, *Indian Government and Politics* (Cosmos Publications, 1992)

¹⁸ Mangal Chandra Jain Kagzi, *The Constitution of India – Vol. 1* (Metropolitan Publishing Company, 1988) 32

Furthermore, under a republic, state sovereignty is bestowed in and preserved by the people, and political power is often used to convey the people's sovereignty, command, grace, and pleasure. The people approve the constitution and receive it. "We, the People" adopt the Indian Constitution, which is then enacted and given over to "themselves". The whole political community has ultimate political power because of the people's choice. The Constituent Assembly, also known as the Congress for the People, was founded by elected representatives of the people who assembled to create the Constitution in the name of the people. It was the Constituent Assembly's decision, and their goal in this regard should be communicated *via* proclamations linked to the Constitution's Preamble.

As a result, it is an adjectivized with the word "Sovereign, Democratic, Republic" in which something is to be kept, tested by the regime many of it does not matter, that the place is replete with a single party majority in numbers or minority but maintaining the confidence of the house or representation of many parties, what really matters is the representation of the plausible conscience and not as consequence, the Constitution recognises a situational democratic process.

While in one place such a thing finds its place in the Preamble of the Constitution of India, elsewhere, is prominently recognized by the Apex Court of land by ensuring legality with "Basic Structure Doctrine" established in *Keshvananda Bharti Case*¹⁹; while in the case of *Kihota Mollohan v. Zachilhu*²⁰ laying down "sovereign, democratic, republican structure" as basic feature of the Constitution and thus imposing the restrictions upon the amending power of the parliament.

Consequently, there is no provision in the Indian Constitution for single-party government. Even a minority administration may run a government if the people believe in it; as the Supreme Court stated in *S.R. Bommai v. Union of India*²¹, the only way to determine if a ministry has lost the House's confidence is to vote on the floor of the House.²² It is not a matter of personal taste

¹⁹ *Keshvananda Bharti Case v. State of Kerala* AIR 1973 SC 1461.

²⁰ *Kihota Mollohan v. Zachilhu* AIR 1993 SC 412

²¹ *S.R. Bommai v. Union of India* (1994) 3 SCC 1

²² *Bommai* (n 21), ¶395

for any individual, whether it the Governor or the President,²³ to appraise the Ministry's strength. In *Jagdambika Pal v. Union of India*²⁴, the Supreme Court ordered a "composite floor test" between the opposing sides, which resulted in Kalyan Singh getting the majority votes.

While the largest single party did not win an absolute majority in the 1989 and 1991 Lok Sabha elections (for the 9th and 10th Lok Sabha, respectively), it was allowed to form a government with the silent support of some other political parties, who, however, refused to enter an alliance government and share the party's electoral responsibility.

In the alliance, there's a new kind of administration, a short-term government anxious to get here. To put it another way, the pro-government coalition was created as a partnership. This kind of administration is known as an alliance government, and it has been shown that it is a political reality rather than a constitutional illusion in a democratic society.

COALITION GOVERNMENT: THE STRUCTURAL DILEMMA

The framers of the Constitution believed that the new Constitution needed to be able to tap wisely and efficiently and direct the energy and leadership available for the achievement of national goals. They also needed to know how social and economic revolutions occur within the democratic process; which form of government they asked for, and whether they would be able to do so smoothly.²⁵ They took a position and focused on two accessible kinds of administration, parliamentary and presidential, due to a lack of political innovations. The Constituent Assembly was later intrigued by the notion, and Jawaharlal Nehru²⁶ chose in favour of the parliamentary system of administration, in which power is concentrated in the legislature and ministries. The Committees on Provincial and Union Constitutions, according to Vallabhbhai Patel²⁷, had agreed that the only parliamentary system of governance would be favoured by India. Dr. B. R. Ambedkar met KM Muni and Alladi Krishnaswamy Iyer, and they discussed the assembly proportionate qualities of these two models, as well as the factors that influence parliamentary

²³ Bommai (n 21), ¶119

²⁴ *Jagdambika Pal v. Union of India* (1999)9 SCC 95

²⁵ Constitutional Assembly Debate Vol VII, 32

²⁶ Constitutional Assembly Debate Vol IV, 713

²⁷ Vol VII (n 25), 578

model selection. For a free India, Ambedkar desired a type of government that could assure an equal degree of permanence and responsibility. However, he discovered that the Presidential form of administration was more stable and accountable than a legislative one. The latter, a daily evaluation of the executive, a periodic evaluation by the legislature and by the people; on the basis of this assessment Ambedkar said:

“Daily evaluation of responsibility which is not available under the American system, it is felt, that it is far more effective than the periodic in a country like India, evaluation is more necessary. The draft of the Constitution is in solicitation for the parliamentary system of the executive has preferred more responsibility for more stability.”

KM Munshi²⁸ and Alladi Krishnaswamy²⁹ Iyer drew attention to India’s lengthy experience with this style of government, as well as the possibility for it to function without friction between the executive and legislative branches.

The founders of the Constitution realised they could import the parliamentary form of government from England, but not the character and nature that fashioned it as a smooth and soft mechanism, and that any conflict between fundamental character and nature and the borrowed constitution would be terrible.³⁰ In England, the Earl of Balfour reported that the government does not work if there are many parties in the House of Commons with the same strength, the way if there are only two parties in the House of Commons. The profound difference between these two is that a change of government will change the amount of revolution. As a result, Ambedkar highlights the need of constitutional ethical farming in India. He highlighted the dangers of parliamentary democracy, which he regarded as being threatened by varied and opposing political parties, as well as caste and creed, as well as political party cults. Rajendra Prasad was also aware that electorates buying votes or putting their confidence in their representatives would limit the number of accountable government officials. He therefore said:

²⁸ Vol VII (n 25), 984

²⁹ Vol VII (n 25), 33

³⁰ Ismail, *The President and Governors in the Indian Constitution* (Orient Longman, 1972) 4

“Ultimately a constitution is a lifeless thing. It attains life because of the man who commands and operate it, which India needs today there is nothing more than a set of honest men who will be interested in the country in prior of them.”³¹

He expressed a mysterious hope that when the country required men of character and they are coming and the public will shove them up.³² However, Ambedkar warned:

“If things go erroneous under the new constitution the reason will not be that we had a bad constitution, what will we do to say that man is despicable.”³³

CONCLUSION: THE PRINCIPLES AND ETHICS BEHIND COALITION

When we talk about the whole coalition system of politics, thanks to media, we have over the years developed the image of a system that evolved as a result of self-compromising of political ideologies and agendas. However, what has vehemently been ignored is the fact that the coalition form of government not only preserves democracy but also promotes it. When two or more parties collate, they form an ideology that is a result of what the majority have supported in elections. Of course, the issue of ‘horse trading’ poses a great smudge on the idea of a coalition, still it would be unfair to overlook its potential advantages.

Understanding in terms of historical events, a very interesting trend could be noticed. When we started on as a naïve democracy, we were for the first time introduced to the idea of party politics. As expected from a budding democracy, people were not as aware of the trends as they are today. This awakening of political responsibility has brought about gigantic changes in the way people perceive their role in a democracy. As a product of this metamorphosis of thoughts, the whole idea of the coalition has risen. India is not like any other global country owing to the wide diversity that its population has. Owing to this, the rise of a single dominant opinion is pretty tough and hence a diversified opinion, channelized through the tunnel of the coalition is the best alternative.

³¹ *Constitutional Assembly Debate* Vol XI, 978

³² Vol IV (n 26), 994

³³ Vol IV (n 26), 44

Political parties across India have understood the importance of this concept of the coalition and hence we have seen the rise of two major alliances, namely the UPA, led by the Indian National Congress and NDA, led by the Bhartiya Janta Party. The ability to mould public opinion is getting harder day by day, owing to the widespread internet connectivity which has enabled people to cross-check the promises being made, the facts being stated and the ground reality of actions being taken. This has indeed opened new horizons and slowly and steadily we are maturing as a democracy. However, the recent Maharashtra, Rajasthan, and Madhya Pradesh episodes cannot be ignored too. The two events have put forward and indeed supported the idea of - '*politics is a dirty game*'.

This idea was the main reason for fear among the constitutional framer too, and going by the recent trend, the nightmare looks to have become a reality. The main aim of having the Constitution was to promote the independence of the people. When it came to the system of government people were sceptical of the parliamentary system, owing to the caste and religion-based politics that they had witnessed earlier. However, that's when the ethics were brought into question, *i.e.*, a political parties' obligations towards its belief. It was assumed that power would not corrupt the morals of a political party. This is the reason why the parliamentary form of government was preferred over the presidential one.

India's electoral system for Lok Sabha elections and the legislative assembly has continued to the plurality system although the nature of governments has changed over the years. At the start, a single-party Congress had majority governments (except that 1967-69) is true until 1977 when the alliance was formed at the Centre, but many things have changed since then. We have argued that alliances with its diversity in India are inevitable. Though we cannot deny the fact that a coalition is a heavy burden to handle, at the same time it's not to be denied that it can still be handled. When we understand the present political state of India and while doing so keep a record of the political fervour that has developed in the past few decades, we come to a conclusion that things are not what they were at the time of Independence. Indeed, to have a majority government was achievable at the start, but with changing perspectives and self-shaping landscapes, the thing which was easy at that time, is next to impossible nowadays. Talking in a nutshell, though always portrayed as an evil and burdensome system, the coalition

is in no way an unconstitutional or unethical practice. It's a symbol or a marker that people have learnt to press forth their views, and hence there exists no reason to despise it. It's high time that this taboo stigma attached to the coalition is dealt with and people are made aware of the strategic advantages it gives because to have a coalition, to run a coalition government, one requires a lot of adjustments, a lot of flexibility and that flexibility provides you with the base for development and triumph.