Critical Analysis of Pressure Groups in Indian Politics

Dr. P. H. Kyarakoppa

Assistant Professor –

Political Science,

GFGC & P.G. Centre,

Gadag-5821021

Abstract:

Society consists of not only individuals but also groups that form based on shared interests. These groups engage in struggles, negotiations, and compromises, ultimately shaping the intricate realm of politics. While political parties actively partake in the political process, various economic, business, religious, cultural, and social entities indirectly participate by exerting pressure on the government to safeguard their interests. Referred to as pressure groups, this paper delves into an examination of diverse pressure groups.

Keywords: Society, Conflicts, Political Parties, Social Groups, Interests, Government

Introduction:

In the United States, intellectuals like David Truman and V.O. Key have extensively studied pressure groups, emphasizing their significance in the political process. These pressure groups systematically promote their interests and mold public opinion to align with their goals. Government officials, political party leaders, and legislators maintain ongoing communication with these pressure groups to gain accurate insights into their concerns. Pressure groups often collaborate with political parties; however, their objective remains focused on influencing government decisions rather than seeking power.

When interest groups take action to shape government policies, they are commonly referred to as pressure groups. A prevalent political technique employed by these groups to influence legislative members is known as 'lobbying'. Pressure groups establish their own lobbies by directly or indirectly employing financial means, such as holding meetings with party members or sending delegations.

Nevertheless, recent times have witnessed instances where certain pressure groups resort to illegal and even violent methods. In the context of a developing nation like India, well-structured pressure groups might not wield as much influence on a large scale as observed in Western countries. Nevertheless, their impact on India's political landscape remains noteworthy. It is conceivable that these pressure groups will assume a pivotal role in India's political process in the future. Western political scholars, including Stanley Kochneck, have meticulously scrutinized pressure groups in India. Thus, a comprehensive understanding of the nature and operations of these pressure groups in the Indian context is imperative.

Nature of Pressure Groups in India:

In Indian society, there exists a pervasive sense of scepticism towards power and politics, often viewing them as vehicles for personal gain. This perspective encourages individuals of moral integrity to distance

themselves from political involvement. Even those engaged in politics often strive to avoid the trappings of power. Indian culture holds a deep admiration for detachment and asceticism, exemplified by Mahatma Gandhi's withdrawal from Congress after 1934 and Jayaprakash Narayan's abstention from electoral contests. Vinoba Bhave, too, opted for a political disengagement by initiating the Sarvodaya movement. This prevalent mindset regarding power and politics has presented challenges for the emergence of pressure groups within Indian politics. The establishment of pressure groups, akin to Western countries, faces resistance as it clashes with the moral fabric of Indian society.

In the pre-independence era, a connection existed between the British rulers and the common populace, with only institutions rooted in traditional caste and religious structures having influence over governance. Given the transparency inherent to this pre-independence democracy, the establishment of pressure groups focused on safeguarding interests and advocating demands faced hurdles. Post-independence, the Congress party served as a convergence point for numerous interest groups, which, upon attaining power, found it more pragmatic to pursue their demands from within the party. Various caste, religious, labor, and professional groups aligned themselves with Congress, inhibiting the autonomous growth of pressure groups in a liberated environment.

A noteworthy consideration while examining pressure groups in India is the interplay between modernity and tradition. Alongside modern pressure groups, there exist traditional ones advocating for the interests of caste, religion, language, and tribal communities.

A distinct trait of Indian pressure groups is their propensity to maintain indirect or covert ties with political parties. This approach aims to retain the sympathy of those who seek detachment from politics. While labor unions in India bear influence from political entities, their formal association remains unestablished, preserving a degree of autonomy.

Pressure groups in India often resort to unconventional methods such as sieges, demonstrations, strikes, and employ Gandhian Satyagraha to assert their demands. Occasionally, these groups have even resorted to violence, illustrating a fourth characteristic of these organizations.

Despite their limitations, pressure groups in India have played a crucial role in shaping political development and fostering public awareness. In a society marked by traditional divisions, these groups have served as connective bridges, linking individuals and institutions, including the military and bureaucracy.

In conclusion, while acknowledging the constraints of pressure groups in India, it remains evident that they contribute significantly to political progress and societal consciousness. These groups operate within a cultural context where traditional norms intersect with modern aspirations. Although pressure groups in India have not attained the same prominence as their Western counterparts, their impact on political dynamics and societal cohesion should not be underestimated.

Organized Business Pressure Groups in India:

Organized business pressure groups in India can be categorized into following main types:

(a) Pressure groups of trade and industrial associations:

The origins of organized business pressure groups in India can be traced back to the early stages of industrial development during the British colonial period. During this time, trade institutions were established at the provincial level, particularly in major cities such as Calcutta, Bombay (now Mumbai), and Madras (now Chennai). For instance, the Calcutta Chamber of Commerce was founded in 1834, followed by the Indian Merchants Chamber of Bombay in 1907 and the Southern Indian Chamber of Commerce in 1909. Additionally, the Marwari traders formed the 'Bharat Chamber of Commerce' (formerly known as the 'Marwari Chamber of Commerce'), and the Bengal National Chamber was established.

The post-independence period witnessed the growth of both the trade and industrial sectors. Regional trade associations began to collaborate to address government policies related to trade and industry, culminating in the formation of the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry (FICCI). The FICCI included the Indian Merchants Chamber of Bombay, the Indian Merchants Chamber of Calcutta, and the House Indian Chamber of Commerce of Madras. The Associated Chamber of Commerce was also established by the Bengal Chamber of Commerce of Calcutta, along with its affiliate, the Central Commercial Organization based in Delhi. Furthermore, small-scale industry professionals founded the All India Manufacturers Organization-Naissen in Delhi, expanding its branches to Calcutta and Mumbai.

During the pre-independence era, the British colonial policies were not conducive to the growth of Indian industry, leading to challenges faced by the business class in trade and industry. Consequently, this period saw the promotion of economic nationalism among the business community.

Post-independence, the Congress party gradually adopted socialist policies, with a significant shift occurring in 1955 during the Aabhadi Session. Economic planning was introduced, accompanied by increased government control over trade and industry. Some industrialists, such as JRD Tata, expressed criticism of these policies and aligned themselves with right-wing parties like the Swatantra Party and the Jana Sangh. However, other industrialists, like Ghanshyamdas Birla, adopted a more pragmatic approach, recognizing the importance of political stability for industrial development.

While industrialists maintained support for the Congress party due to its potential to ensure stability, they also recognized the influence of bureaucracy and often engaged more with administrative officials than political leaders. Recent instances, such as those in 1990 involving tax refunds, illustrate the reliance of industrialists on administrative channels.

Compared to pressure groups in the United States, Indian business pressure groups employ different tactics due to the parliamentary system and limited financial resources. Rather than relying heavily on traditional lobbying, these groups often operate through direct or indirect means, including financial contributions and

support for political parties or affiliated institutions. Although a law banning donations to political parties was passed in 1969, subsequent amendments have allowed political parties to receive donations from industrialists.

In conclusion, organized business pressure groups in India have evolved in response to historical and political developments. Their engagement strategies, influenced by the Indian context, involve a combination of direct and indirect methods to advocate for their interests within the framework of the country's political landscape.

(b) Labor / Trade Union Pressure Groups in India:

The labor movement in India traces its origins back to the British colonial period. The initial attempt at forming a trade union was made by Lokhande in Mumbai, while in 1918, B. P. Wadia established a labor organization in Madras, thereby catalyzing the labor movement. Subsequently, the All India Trade Union Congress (AITUC) was formed in 1920, under the leadership of Lala Lajpat Rai. The AITUC became an integral part of the national movement and collaborated with the Indian National Congress. During the late 1920s, communist labor leaders gained prominence within the AITUC, resulting in a power struggle with Congress. By 1942, the Communists gained control over AITUC while Congress leaders were imprisoned during the 'Quit India' movement. However, in 1944, the Congress formed its independent trade union, INTUC, under its own leadership. Post-independence, the Indian National Trade Union Congress and Hind Mazdoor Sabha were also established as significant labor organizations.

The propensity of political parties in India to splinter is mirrored within trade unions. Often, trade unions are aligned with major political parties, leading to divisions when political parties split. This phenomenon was evident when the Samajwadi Party and the Congress-led worker unions united to form the Hind Mazdoor Sabha after the formation of the Janata Party. Similarly, the split within the Communist Party in 1964 led to the formation of the Centre for Indian Trade Unions (CITU).

Trade unions in India have adopted various strategies to address labor issues. While some have cooperated with both the government and employers to resolve conflicts, others have leaned towards more combative and, in some cases, irrational methods. The Bombay Industrial Relations Act (BIR) of 1948, enacted in the state of Mumbai, mandated recognition for organizations where at least 30% of workers were members.

However, criticisms persist regarding the priorities of labor organizations. Some assert that these organizations tend to prioritize financial demands, often neglecting broader national interests. Left-leaning labor groups, aspiring to bring about revolutionary change through organized labor, have faced confusion and disillusionment over time. This has resulted in a divergence between wage-related demands and revolutionary ideologies.

While trade unions advocate for wage increases, there is a perception that workers may not always exhibit a corresponding commitment to their duties. Opposition to mechanization, driven by concerns of job reduction, has further hindered industrial modernization.

The fragmentation and internal disputes within trade unions have often resulted in failures, causing losses for workers. Unreasonable demands and strikes at inopportune times, often influenced by external factors, have further complicated labor issues. Additionally, the relationship between trade unions and employers has sometimes been questionable, with accusations of financial improprieties.

Many trade unions in India have become intertwined with political parties, impeding their ability to make independent decisions. These unions often participate in political events such as strikes for political reasons, and decision-making processes within these organizations may lack true democratic participation.

A growing concern is the escalation of violence associated with trade union activities, leading to a sense of fear and intimidation within their spheres of influence. In essence, it can be argued that trade unions in India have yet to fully mature. Their approach often lacks a forward-looking perspective, leading to negative outcomes that impede the country's industrial progress.

Concluding Remarks:

The prevailing sense of skepticism towards power and politics within Indian society has impeded the growth of pressure groups in the country's political landscape. Despite this, in the pre-independence era, various interest groups converged within the Congress party, a trend that continued even after India gained independence. These associations encompass modern pressure groups linked not only to commercial, industrial, and agricultural sectors, but also traditional ones aimed at safeguarding caste, religious, linguistic, and tribal interests.

Indian pressure groups establish covert, rather than overt, relationships with political parties, resorting to tactics like sieges, demonstrations, strikes, and Gandhian Satyagraha to advance their demands, often taking non-parliamentary routes. While the development of pressure groups in India falls short of that in Western nations, these entities have played a pivotal role in bridging the gaps within a society marked by traditional divisions, thereby contributing to the success of democratic governance.

Three primary categories of organized professional pressure groups in India are trade and industrial organizations, labor unions, and peasant unions. Additionally, unorganized pressure groups include those comprised of students, youth, and women from specific regions. This diverse landscape underscores the unique pattern of pressure group formation in India. In the context of numerous political parties within the country, some observers argue that since many of these parties function akin to pressure groups, the significance of pressure groups outweighs that of political parties in Indian politics.

Relevant sources for further understanding and research on pressure groups and Indian politics include:

References:

1. Dr. Ram Ayodhya Singh (2014), Political Parties, Pressure Groups and Social Movement K.K. Publisher, Delhi
2. W.N. Coxall (2001),Pressure Groups in British Politics, Pearson Education Publication, Chennai

3. Grova Verinder, Politics of Influence, Violence and Pressure Groups, Vol.8.

4. Pursuit of Lakshmi. (&) Farmer Power, Seminar Issue, No. 352, December, 1988.

5. R. P. Srivastava (2011), Pressure Groups in Indian Politics, Shree Publishers & Distributors, Pune

6. Harold Crouch & C. K. Johri (1967), Trade Unions and Politics in India, Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, Vol. 2, No. 3, Pg. No. 410-413 4.