

Role of the Communist Political Parties in Indian Federal System

Dr. Sudeep Kumar*

Assistant Professor, DAV College Pehowa, Kurukshetra - 136128

Abstract - *"The essence of federalism should be searched for, not in the nuances of constitutional and legal nomenclature, but in the economic, social, political, and cultural factors that have necessitated the external forms of federalism. The foundation of federalism is found in the community itself, not in its institutional or constitutional framework. The federal characteristics of the society are expressed and safeguarded by the federal government. In a federal system, there are two levels of government: one at the center and one at the outside. It is the sacred duty of provincial governments to greater benefit from the lowest strata; they reflect the desires and ambitions of the local populace. In contrast, the central government stands for national interests; it is the mirror that reflects the state of the whole nation. National security and economic development are under the control of the federal government. This essay examines the function of communist political parties in the federal government of India.*

Keywords - federal system, government, political parties, national security.

-----X-----

INTRODUCTION

There is a tight connection between federalism and partisan politics. They have a huge say in how the federal government operates. Political parties are vehicles for interest articulation and the manifestation of the will of the people. Political parties establish federal policies and serve as institutional connectors that foster cooperative relationships between the federal government and the states. Federal policy and center-state relations are largely determined by the policies and ideologies of the major political parties. How the federal government and individual states interact with one another is a function of the central government's relationship with the state governments they control. There won't be any need to worry about tensions between the federal government and the states if just one party holds power at both levels. [1]

When it comes to managing the federal government, political parties play a crucial role. Riker argues that "party system is arguably the most essential aspect in the federalizing process, among the multiple political variables such as interest groups, elite groupings, political attitude, and political movements." Center-state relationships are crucial to the health of a federal system. Public opinion, pressure organizations, state level politics, media, leadership, and political parties all have a role in shaping central-state relations. W.H. Morris Jones made an astute observation when he said, "Indian federalism is a form of co-operative federalism where negotiating took place between the center and the states, but finally a solution came forth and both decided to co-operate." How the Indian

federal government and its individual states use the authority granted to them shapes the character of federal-state relations, and the federal government's ability to maintain good relations with states relies on cooperation between the federal government and the states.[2]

As a result, political parties are very influential in the making of laws and regulations. With this in mind, the role of the governing group or groups is more significant than that of the opposition parties. The opposition parties' influence on policymaking has diminished. It is widely acknowledged that political parties are a significant institutional variable that shapes the substance of public policy and, by extension, the character of a country's federal process. This makes any effort to examine the federal system through the lens of the nation's political parties all the more important.[3]

The relationship between the central government and the states is an essential part of India's federal system. In this section, we will analyze how the CPI or CPI (M) see central-state ties. Since its inception, the CPI or CPI (M) have voiced their displeasure with a number of aspects of the Indian Federal System, including Article 370, the special status of Jammu and Kashmir, the use of Article 356, the appointment of governors and the distribution of revenue, the deployment of the CRPF, and the policies and programs of the CPI and CPI (M) (M). However, communist parties have taken a neutral stance on federalism. They favor a robust federal government, but they also stress the need of granting states considerable freedom.[4]

THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF INDIA'S STANCE ON CENTER-STATE RELATIONS

Center-State Relations are crucial to a federal system. The federal system of a country is profoundly affected by the actions of the national government. Almost every major political party includes substantial discussion of federalism and centrist ideas and programs. The Communist Party of India has been vocally opposed to the Indian Federal System ever since it was formed. Accordingly, it is important to grasp the CPI's stance on the Indian federal system. The Communist Party of India (CPI) bills itself as "the political party of the Indian working class, its vanguard, or its highest form of class organization" in its constitution. It's a group of workers, peasants, and other laborers who have voluntarily banded together in the sake of socialism and communism.[5]

Ajoy Ghosh learned everything fresh that has happened in India and the world. The CPI quickly rose to prominence in Parliament and the biggest society, becoming just the congress's second major political and social rival. More than that, the Communists are the ones who other political forces and the general public have turned to for answers to national and class questions like the public sector, nationalization, development of economic infrastructure or structures, democracy, the communal fascist menace, the struggle for peace and disarmament, the rights of the masses, friendship with socialist countries, and so on. The Communists dominated society and were always at the forefront of major developments.[6]

The Communist Party of India is a political organization in India that advocates for and defends anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist values, as well as secularism, democracy, Marxism-Leninism, nonalignment, and nonviolence. From an ideological perspective, it was quite close to the Soviet Communist Party's goals and programs up until very recently. The CPI, like other Communist Parties across the globe, has been striving to articulate clearly its ideological principles since the development of Anti-Communist Movements in the Soviet Union or other Socialist Republics, rather ex socialist states of Europe. The CPI recognizes socialism as an ultimate aim but argues that it should not be presented as an urgent objective due to India's unique conditions. The CPI is now a symbol of democracy and economic and social redevelopment. The CPI maintains that only a united leftist and democratic front can accomplish this. 10 The CPI supports measures to prevent religious institutions from being used to foster communalism and animosity amongst various populations, to safeguard the rights of all minorities, and to preserve the secular democratic system as a whole.[7]

The Communist Party of India agrees with the Sarkaria Commission's proposal to reorganize center-state ties to provide more authority and resources to states. The Communist Party of India's 12 members believe that the fate of any state government should be determined

on the floor of the assembly and that the arbitrary use of Article 356 to dismiss state governments must be prohibited. The Indian Communist Party will revitalize the ineffective Inter-State Council and get it back to work.[8]

ABUSE OF ARTICLE 356

Article 356 of the Constitution, which allows the President to declare martial law in the event of a "failure of Constitutional Machinery in the state," has been the source of the greatest debate. The wording might mean either thing or nothing at all. The constant misuse of Article 14, which reads, "If a situation has arisen in which the governance of the state cannot be carried out in conformity with the provisions of the constitution," has resulted in the abuse of the Constitution by all governments. [9]

The Governor is largely responsible for determining whether a crisis calls for action from the federal government. Given his role as the President's personal advisor, the Governor's status will inevitably shift from that of an autonomous leader of the state to that of a centrally appointed representative. However, the President is able to act "otherwise" and impose his Rule on the State if the Governor fails to report to him as required. There is still some uncertainty as to whether or not the federal government may declare a state ministry ineffective due to allegations of corruption and poor management. H.N. Kunzru raised the question, "Is it the aim of Article 278 and 278A to empower the central government to interfere in the problems of the provinces for the good governance?" [10]

That power is not delegated to the center," Ambedkar firmly retorted. Whether or whether a province has a decent government is not something that should be decided in the center. Thus, it would seem that the President or the Administration of India have no leeway under the Article to evaluate the quality of the government. That's where democracy's flaws come in. Six times during Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's reign, twice during Lai Bahadur Shastri's tenure, nine times during Moraji Desai's rule, five times during Charan Singh's rule, and forty-eight times during Indira Gandhi's term as Prime Minister, between 1966–1977 and 1980–1984.[11]

As early as 1977, it was clear that this Article was dangerously unfederal. A Presidential decree from the Janata Party in the center removed nine democratically elected state governments, or the Janata Party in the center took all the powers formerly held by the state legislatures. It goes without saying that the nine states in question were governed by political parties in opposition to the Janata Party, but given its strong central position, the latter still decided to exert its influence there using the Article 356 "shortcut." They said that the landslide win of the Janata Party in these states' parliamentary elections showed that the administrations of these states by

other political parties lacked the moral authority to do so. Many people questioned the validity of the main action, or the political system was stressed to the breaking point as a result. They went on to say that the Union Government's decision to dissolve the nine Assemblies was based on politics, was illegal, and was an effort to change the foundation of our federal democracy. [12]

How do you use Art.356's authority to remove a state government? No less an individual than Dr. Ambedkar voiced in the Constituent Assembly a desire that Art. 356 be utilized only in exceptional circumstances. How come it was utilized so frequently? Are there predetermined limits on how it may be used? The Supreme Court found justification for the use of Article 356 authority in *S.R. Bommai v. India*. The Court ruled that the removal of Kamatak and Nagaland's governments were unlawful, while it sustained the removal of those in Madhya Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh, and Rajasthan. However, appropriate boundaries for the use of the authority under Art. 356 must be hammered out via the democratic process. In the case *Bommai vs. India*, the Supreme Court noted that Article 356 had been used to remove 82 state governments and 13 Union Territory administrations prior to 1972. As for whether or not judicial review is the best way to avoid the misuse of Article 356's powers, we are unsure. It is not possible to use judicially manageable norms to answer matters of a political character.[13]

According to Article 355 of India's constitution, the federal government is responsible for safeguarding the individual states from external enemies or internal disturbances and ensuring that each state's government operates in line with the document's dictates. However, the President may issue a proclamation under Article 356 to assume any function of the state government, including those of the Governor and other state authorities, if he is convinced, upon receiving the report from the Governor or otherwise, that the government of the state cannot be carried on in accordance with the provisions of the constitution. However, President's Governed is truly rule by and for the Union Governments, thus ensuring their contentment is essential. It would be fascinating and maybe even enlightening at this moment to reflect on the use and abuse of Art. 356 since our constitution went into effect.[14]

In our federal system of government, the Legislative branch is responsible for enacting Acts and Laws, the Judiciary is responsible for interpreting those Acts and Laws, and the Executive branch is responsible for carrying them out. It would seem that the role of the judiciary is strictly one of interpretation. However, the function of the court has become more important throughout time, particularly in interpreting the Constitution's many sections and even its very framework. 22 The court began to look into the

partisan role of governors, and through a series of rulings, it has been able to restrict the discriminating powers of the Governor by establishing new boundaries for his or her impartial behavior. In 2006, the Governor of Bihar, Buta Singh, resigned after a court ruling revealed his prejudiced actions. To be sure, the process of formalizing the institution of Governors was established as really "Constitutional" with the ruling in the infamous *Bommai* case. Supreme Court, in its decision on the well-known *Bommai* case, established guidelines for how the federal government must implement Article 356.[15]

PRESERVING DEMOCRATIC PROCESSES AND RIGHTS

The Left Front Government has safeguarded the democratic rights & civil freedoms of the people of the state, and has made significant and consistent efforts to build democratic institutions. This is in accordance with the realization that strengthening democracies is a necessary, if not sufficient, prerequisite for promoting the interests of the working people & ensuring that the benefits of development really reach them. 217 Between 1971 and 1977, Congress state and federal administrations launched six years of semi-fascist terror across the state, with the goal of destroying the CPI's support system (M). The rights of the people were violated, and any resistance to the assassination of democracy is met with brutal punishment. All of this, according to the CPI (M), is incompatible with a Marxist worldview since it reflects "just a restricted and traditional nature of bourgeois parliamentary. According to the CPI (M), the bourgeois-democratic constitution not only serves as a front for the bourgeoisie's tyranny over the working people, but it also strips away democratic rights from the opposition within the ruling classes. Therefore, the cries of "the one party tyranny of the Congress" from bourgeois democratic parties.[16]

According to the CPI (M) Program, "when the masses begin to employ parliamentary democracy, the reactionary bourgeoisies & landowners may not hesitate to crush underfoot Parliamentary democracy or even replace it with military dictatorship." Prakash Karat, general secretary of the Communist Party of India (M), said, "The CPI and the CPI (M) convened their party congress a year ago. In putting forward its ideas and programs, the Left has made strides over the last three years, as seen by its track record. The Left has been particularly notable for its staunch advocacy of secularism and expose of the BJP or its RSS mentor's divisive and harmful communal tactics. As shown in West Bengal, Kerala, and Tripura, the Left has not only battled against communalism but also demonstrated that communal politics can be isolated and the people can rally in defense of secular norms. The approaching days call for a redoubling of our efforts to combat the Hindutva elements politically and intellectually in order to prevent their resurgence to power.

ATTITUDE TO THE CENTRE

Right from the start of the United Front Ministry, the subject of the attitude to be taken towards the center appeared as one of the most crucial issues on which fundamental disagreements formed between the CPI and CPI (M). To paraphrase the "Joint Declaration" of the 7 parties before to the 1967 election, "the Centre is striving progressively to deprive the regions of even those authorities assigned to the constitution and thereby cut at the independent powers or status of the states." The federal government will make every effort to thwart the state's bid for more authority and will rally the public in its cause. As we have seen, the CPI (M) believed that the state governments were unable to solve any of the basic issues confronting them in their current position and that it would be essential for them to conduct aggressive conflicts against the center in order to achieve their goals.

We have also taken notice of the CPI's belief that the United Front Parties, working within the structure of the state government, can and must provide the essential assistance to the people. For the party to succeed, "it is the obligation of the party to show via the accomplishment of these ministries that it is feasible, even with the limited powers they have to answer the pressing needs of the people and execute the agenda they have undertaken," it said. Early on, the CPI (M) stated that "every issue from farm to people's food will be an arena of class struggle" and that "the basic reality is that the levers of economic power are in the hands of the big capitalists as well as landlords, that the entire might of the law, constitution, bureaucracy, and administration supports the maintenance of this vested interest." This was an excellent indicator of the CPI (M)'s attitude orientation and anticipated stance on the attitude to centre. The Communist Party of China (Marxist) launched yet another anti-Communist Party of China (CPC) campaign in May 1968 because the CPC refused to focus on the battle against the central government. The CPI (M) accused the CPI (M) in June of conspiring to topple the CPI (M) led United front government and build up a new United front administration with the assistance of the Congress party.

Once again, in June, E.M.S.Namboodripad and A.K.Gopalan issued a joint statement in which they argued that while the CPI and other parties believed that they should somehow maintain friendly relations with the center, the CPI (M) believed that the existence of non-congress govt itself depended on the struggle against the Central government, as proved by the experience of West Bengal or other non-Congress states. In September of 1968, when the CPI (M) Chief Minister declined to arrest Central government workers for participating in a strike, the CPI (M) campaign against the center achieved its zenith. Relations between the CPI and CPI (M) remained tense due to these disagreements even up to the very end of the United Front Ministry in Kerala.

We have seen that the CPI sees the Congress as a progressive force, that it seeks to unite with the masses who have rallied behind the Congress, and that it seeks to win over the supporters of right-wing parties so that it can fight alongside them against the right-wing leadership of both the right-wing parties and the Congress. When considering how to respond to parties outside of the congress, the Communist Party would do well to take the view that all such parties are, to varying degrees, parties of the Indian bourgeois. In order to combat the anti-democratic twist given to these parties' demands by their leadership, the Communist Movement should adopt the strategy of isolating and defending the democratic core of the numerous demands put up by these parties. The Congress Party is the progressive bourgeoisie's party, thus there's no question about automatically backing it against these other parties, which are headed by reactionary forces.[17]

CONCLUSION

Changes in the center-state relationship fluctuated intermittently during the 1990s, as this diagram shows. The Indian federal system has been heavily influenced by the ebb and flow of central-state relations on topics such as the imposition of President's Rule, the appointment of Governors, and the demand for more autonomy on the part of the states, especially with regard to Jammu and Kashmir. The rise of multi-party coalitions in Indian politics has also had a profound effect on the quality of that country's federal system.

REFERENCES

1. Bhargave, G.S., and Umashankar, Phadnis, (Ed.), To Whom does the State belong: Emerging Issues in Indian Politics, Har-Anand Publication, New Delhi, 2021.
2. Bombwall, K.R., Indian Politics and Government, Atman Ram and Sons, Delhi, 2019.
3. Chandrashekhar, C.V., Political Parties with Special Reference to India, Rochouse and Sons, Madras, 2017.
4. Chaube, S.K., and Susheela, Kaushik., Indian Democracy at the turn of Century, Kanishka Publications, New Delhi, 2021.
5. Chowdhury, Chandra, Gupta., Indian States People in the Struggle for Democracy and National Unification, CPI Publication, August, 2018.
6. Divatia, Kumud., The Nature of Inter-Relations of Governments in India in the 21st Century, Popular Publication, Bombay, 2019.
7. Dr. Sing, S.P., Research Methods in Social Sciences, Kanishka Publisher, New Delhi, 2021.
8. Elazar, Daniel.J., Exploring Federalism, Tuscaloosa University of Alabama Press, New Delhi, 2020.

9. Frankel, Francine, R., Hassan Zoya., Bhargava Rajeeva, and Arora Balveera, (Ed.),., Transforming India .Social and Political Dynamics of Democracy, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2020.
10. Gani, H.A., Centre-State Relations and Sarkaria Commission Issues: Institutions and Challenges, Deep and Deep Publications, New Delhi, 2019.
11. Gopalkumar, G., The Congress Party and State Politics Emergence of a New Style Politics, Deep and Deep Publication, New Delhi, 2017.
12. Gwyer, and Appadoria., Speeches and Documents on the Indian Constitution 1921 to 1947, VOL.I, Oxford University Press, London, 2016.
13. Hassan, Mushoirul., Introduction to India's Partition Process; Strategy and Mobilization, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2017
14. Ram, Sunder., Role of Opposition Parties in Indian Politics, Deep and Deep Publication, New Delhi, 2019.
15. Ray, Bharathi., Evolution of Federalism in India, Progressive Publisher, Calcutta, 2018.
16. Saez, Lawrence., and Adeney, Katharine., Coalition Politics and Hindu Nationalism, Routledge Publication, New York, 2015.
17. Sankhadher, M. M., Framework of Indian Politics, Geetanjali Publishing House, New Delhi, 2016.

Corresponding Author

Dr. Sudeep Kumar*

Assistant Professor, DAV College Pehowa,
Kurukshetra - 136128