

# Role of opposition in new Indian politics

Dr. Kamal Kumar Bharia

Assistant Professor in Political Science

S.K.Govt. Girls College, Sikar (Rajasthan).

## Abstract

*India is going through a difficult moment right now, and threats are emanating from within the country in the form of anti-nationalistic rhetoric and protest movements. This is the darkest era of propaganda against democratic set-ups. Demonstrations are an essential component of the social and political fabric of democratic societies such as India's. Our system of liberal democracy is currently being challenged by political ideologies and groups oriented to the left that are attempting to advance democratic right to resist and put forward unreasonable demands. The recent uptick in communal events demands that immediate attention be paid to the fact that India has to conduct an internal investigation into the functioning of democracy and develop a new approach to criticize the government in the name of resistance to the call of the government. At this moment, our first concern would be to intensify our efforts to establish a nonviolent society in India, one in which all peoples, irrespective of their differences and un-commonalities, co-exist peacefully and work for the common welfare and progress. The defense of democratic institutions and principles is the government's first priority, and it is also responsible for ensuring that individuals' rights to freedom of speech and expression themselves are upheld. Despite the fact that the constitution has a number of robust provisions, there are certain anti-national groups that pose a danger to the established system of government through acts of sabotage and disturbance. This article will highlight the ways in which opposition parties violate the mandate of the administration that was elected.*

**keywords:** *opposition, politics*

## Introduction

The Constitution of India stipulates that every individual in India has the right to have their right to life as well as their right to personal liberty safeguarded. It provides an adequate level of protection for fundamental rights against arbitrary decisions. The issues of the rule of law and access to justice are extremely important components of the system that provides justice, and they go hand in hand to guarantee that the aura of the legal system reaches all of the people in a country's various demographics. Access to justice should be simplified and streamlined, and each of the three parts of government—the legislative branch, the executive branch, and the judicial branch—should play a significant role in making sure that this concept is adhered to and that the right processes are put into place. Access to justice should be simplified and streamlined. In this sense, the function that the Judiciary plays in exercising supervision, in its status as the "Guardian" of both the Constitution and the people, is of particular significance. People from all over the world have been paying attention to the recent public demonstrations that have taken place in our country, which have broken all previous records for size and scope. These protests have been planned in order to forward the demands, which have assumed the form of a protest movement, that the government reexamine its choices that were made in the interest of the nation as a whole. The right to demonstrate freely is an indispensable component of every

democratic government, including the one that we have. These sorts of protests are the sign and trademark of a liberal democratic society, which has as its logical demand that those in authority listen to what the people have to say. Those in authority are required to listen to what the people have to say since it is a requirement of the liberal democratic society. It suggests that individuals have the right to express their dissatisfaction with the existing state of affairs and to make demands for changes to be made in the social, political, and economic structures that are in place. Protests have the ability to bring about change over the course of history; in fact, they have already taken control of long-term policies and the lives of individual people. As a consequence of this, the right to demonstrate is a crucial one, and it should be exercised for adequate durations of time in order to bring about fundamental changes in government, as the courts in India have emphasized on several occasions. Now, the question that needs to be answered is whether or not citizens have the legal ability to form their own laws and harm state property in the name of basic rights. The response to this question is required. It is important to act with extreme caution while determining the boundaries of publicly held demonstrations. It is conceivable to take Article 19 of the Indian Constitution, which allows us the right to free speech and expression, to mean that everyone has the ability to voice their own view, including on the manner in which the government acts. This is one of the various interpretations of what it means to have the right to free speech and expression. In point of fact, this is the basis upon which our multi-party system is formed, in which opposition parties are considered as useful opponents rather than enemies, and healthy rivalry for political power is promoted. In other words, this is the foundation upon which our multi-party system is based. But incompetence and a lack of real political commitments are leading the trend to move noticeably in a different direction, which is causing the trend to shift in a different direction. Additionally, it would appear that the political leadership of the opposition is carrying a sick mindset, and they are in a rush for speedy results, which is an act of intolerance that is unsuitable in a democracy. Additionally, they look to be carrying a sick mindset since they are in a hurry. As of right now, India is going through a period of political intolerance, and it's probable that this is occurring simply because of Shri. Narendra Modi, who has emerged as a powerful and unrivaled leader who is determined to pushing India to greater heights. India has been the scene of a considerable amount of action under the leadership of Shri. Modi, including the execution of Jandhan Yojana, Swatch Bharat, the demonetization of money, and the repeal of Article 370. These are just some of the initiatives that have been taken. He has been a pivotal player in the taking of some of the toughest decisions that any Prime Minister of India has ever made in the interest of the greater good of the country, including steps that are essential in order to abolish the taboos that are associated with it. Shri Modi, who is now serving as the Prime Minister of India, has accomplished more in terms of fame and acclaim than any other Prime Minister in India's history of independent governance. For the very first time in the history of our age, we experienced a sense of nationalism fervor and looked up in awe and admiration to the dynamic side of political leadership. The role of 'watchdog' is the one that opposition parties in India play the most prominently in the country. This is due to the fact that opposition parties in India exist. In point of fact, it guarantees that the government is accountable by maintaining a close watch on how it runs and bringing to light any faults that are detected in its operations. It is the role of the opposition to bring to light any abuse of power, and this includes calling attention to both acts of action and omissions in the chain of events that led to the abuse. Any critique must to always be well-informed, and every assertion ought to be adequately substantiated by facts. The presence of an opposition that is active and constructive is the safest and most dependable insurance against a dysfunctional and unhealthy democracy. A disagreement in ideological perspective is not the same thing as behaving in a manner that is detrimental to the nation's interests. Concerns regarding the policies and laws that are now being presented by the government and are being examined by Parliament are well within the opposition's legal rights to voice. Shri. Modi was able to accept his post as Prime Minister of India on the

basis of the mandate received in the general elections held in 2014. These elections took place in 2014. Since then, certain party leaders have rejected the desire of the people of India, and now that we have the advantage of hindsight, we can understand the nefariousness of the actions that these officials took. In addition, we are able to recognize a pattern in the campaign of intolerance, which includes the upheaval that occurred at Jawaharlal Nehru University, the passage of the Comprehensive Anti-Tribalism Act, and the enactment of the Three Farm Laws. Every one of these movements receives financial and logistical backing from the opposition, which also receives assistance from international relief organizations. In a democracy, the people and the leaders who are elected by the voters have a trustworthy connection with one another. This is because the populace decides who will lead. The making of serious promises serves as the activity's primary building block. People invest their trust in their leaders and vote them into power because they have faith that those leaders will fulfill the commitments they have made to the people. Near the end of a leader's term in office, people expect accountability because they want elected officials to follow the pledges they make over the course of their campaigns. The opposition must refrain from acting as an impediment to development and must not impede the forward movement of the steps. It is of the highest significance that the political parties that are deemed to be the opposition are aware of the fact that the political function that they play in a robust democracy such as India demands them to be more vigilant, active, public-spirited, and courageous than they have ever been before. In light of the current situation, it is not only a moral but also a political duty of the opposition to continually deliver criticism that is properly informed of the method in which the administration is handling the matter. Aside from that, it is the role of the opposition to successfully put pressure on the government to rectify the flaws in its policies and present realistic and better alternatives in order to expertly deal with the issue. This is the only way the opposition will be able to effectively address the problem. For the same reason, the political forces that are opposed to the current government in India ought to acknowledge their function as an institutional watch dog as well as a credible platform with a plausible vision and the capacity to assist vulnerable sections of hapless citizenry by providing alternative policy options as well as assurances. It is not to claim that the active and vigilant way of the opposition would inevitably provide unlimited accountability from the governing party, particularly when it holds solid parliamentary majority and sufficient popular support. This is not to claim that it would necessarily ensure unrestricted responsibility from the governing party. Instead, the purpose of this paragraph is to make the suggestion that the alert and watchful manner displayed by the adversary is not likely to have this impact. However, one of the propositions that is not being supported is the assumption that a credible opposition can compensate for inefficiency or flaws in administration. This is not one of the propositions that is being supported. On the other hand, a responsible opposition has the potential to ensure that an elected administration is kept on its toes throughout the entirety of the crisis management process. This is not only in the best interest of the nation and the people of the nation, but also in the best interest of the political resurgence of the opposition. As a consequence of this, when confronted with a severe crisis, the political space within a democracy that is open to the practice of alternative politics ought to expand rather than constrict even further. The National Democratic Alliance (NDA) has been under criticism from opposition parties, which have demanded that the Union government provide a comprehensive statement about the stalemate between India and China in Ladakh. This demand has surfaced as a direct consequence of the stalemate that took place in Ladakh between India and China. Since the border disputes with China first surfaced in April 2020, opposition parties have demanded that the government of the union offer a comprehensive explanation as well as information regarding the efforts it has made since that time. The parties that are opposed to the government are interested in gathering more information regarding the events that took place in Galwan. Specifically, they want to know the number of Indian soldiers who gave their lives in the conflict, the number of Chinese soldiers who were killed during the fighting, and the steps

that have been taken by the government, both diplomatically and in other ways, to protect the national interest. Despite the fact that the issue at hand is of the utmost vital national and strategic importance, the administration has been unable to earn the trust of opposing parties. In addition, significant opposition groups are putting pressure on the ruling Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), demanding that four of the 11 legislative measures included in the Parliament session to replace ordinances be submitted for further parliamentary scrutiny. This request is being made in response to the fact that the BJP is now under pressure. This adds even more pressure to the already stressful situation that the BJP is in. There are a total of four pieces of legislation, three of which deal to the agriculture sector, and one of which covers changes in regulatory requirements within the banking business. The Farmers' Produce Trade and Commerce (Promotion and Facilitation) Ordinance, 2020, The Farmers (Empowerment and Protection) Agreement on Price Assurance and Farm Services Ordinance, 2020, and The Essential Commodities (Amendment) Ordinance, 2020, which got passed in Lok Sabha on later, are some of the ordinances that have caused controversy with the opposition. All three of these ordinances were passed in 2020. One of the BJP's coalition partners that has been with them the longest, the Shiromani Akali Dal (SAD), has come out officially against the laws that are associated with farmers. Given the dynamics of the situation, this poses a problem for the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP). It has been made abundantly clear to the leadership of the BJP by the leadership of the SAD that it will be difficult for the party to support these ordinances owing to the SAD's opinion that these ordinances will not be to the benefit of farmers. This belief has been communicated to the leadership of the BJP. Before introducing these proposals, the Central government should have, at the very least, consulted the parties that are largely farmer's parties and the parties that support them. The political conflict amongst NDA coalitions about agricultural ordinances, for which legislations have been brought in to address the disputes, has reached a new degree of severity. The legislations for which have been brought in to resolve the disagreements. On the other hand, the government has made it abundantly clear that the farm policies are forward-thinking, given that they will boost agricultural production. This is the case by virtue of the fact that they have made this assertion. When the subject was brought up during a cabinet meeting, however, there were certain farmer-based parties that expressed concern about the matter. In addition, opposition parties are against the Bill, and they feel that the center should work to find solutions to the problems that have been raised by farmers.

## **Leaders of the opposition in Westminster-model democracies**

Throughout the 19th and 20th centuries, Britain and the Commonwealth worked to build parliamentary democracies in line with the Westminster model. These democracies are still in use today. These democracies concentrate administrative authority and legislative leadership in a cabinet, which consists of ministers headed by a prime minister who is the leader of the majority party or coalition in the lower house of parliament. The cabinet is led by a prime minister who is the leader of the majority party or coalition in the lower house of parliament. Over the course of these centuries, various democracies were cultivated in Britain and the Commonwealth. The Prime Minister and Cabinet are Politically Responsible to the Lower House of Parliament for the Policy and Conduct of the Government. Nevertheless, While in Office, the Prime Minister and Cabinet Can Usually Rely on the Loyal Support of a Majority within That House. As a result, the Prime Minister is in a position to direct the whole process, from the formulation of policies through the implementation of those programs. Constitutions modeled after the Westminster system, and especially those adopted after the 1950s, make extensive provisions for the recognition and powers of the leader of the opposition, both inside and outside of parliament. This is done because a recognized opposition is a necessary counterweight to this fusion of powers in the cabinet. This is done because a well-known adversary is required, thus it is vital to have one.

As a result of the checks and balances provided by the opposition, the leadership of the prime minister is prevented from becoming excessively autocratic. If there were no opposition, a majoritarian administration would have no such checks and balances. According to Bagehot (1873: 53), who writes on the Westminster style of government, "Criticism of administration is as much a part of the polity as administration itself." It is probable that the unequivocal acknowledgment of the resistance included inside such constitutions is the secret to their comparatively lengthy lifespans as a whole. The fact that the opposition in democracies that are modeled after Westminster performs a dual role in the political system, both in terms of moderating power and fighting for power, is one of the most essential elements of the opposition in democracies that are based on the Westminster model. In its function as a moderating force, the opposition's goal is to exert influence on government policy, to drive the government into making policy compromises, and to compel the government to take into consideration the interests that are represented by the opposition. This is the opposition's aim. If we are successful on this front, it may lead to judgments on public policy that are superior, more inclusive, and enjoy the backing of a larger population.

However, as a competing force, the opposition may choose to concentrate on scrutinizing the administration and openly criticizing its flaws, all the while providing the government adequate room to make mistakes and then being held accountable for those mistakes. This is one strategy that may be adopted by the opposition. Because of this, the opposition will be able to portray themselves as a more credible and appealing alternative candidate in the future election. As was said before, the opposition under such systems may be regarded as an alternative government or as a government that is only "waiting its turn" to seize power. This is because such systems provide for several ways for power to be distributed. It is possible that the present leader of the opposition will become tomorrow's prime minister if their party is victorious in the forthcoming general election. A substantial percentage of the democracies that are based on Westminster also include something that is termed a shadow cabinet. In much the same way as the prime minister has a counterpart in the shape of the leader of the opposition, the opposition has a committee comprised of senior members of parliament that is responsible for shadowing the cabinet and developing opposition strategy with regard to specific ministries. For example, the position of foreign secretary, which is also known as the minister of foreign affairs, will have a shadow foreign secretary. This position would be held by a senior opposition member who will act as the opposition's spokesman on issues pertaining to international relations. In Canada, the opposition spokespersons are referred to be "critics" (for example, the minister of national defense is shadowed by the defense critic), which hints to a portion of their role, which is to lead criticism and inspection of the government in the field of their ministry. In other words, critics are the opposition spokespersons. However, criticism is not the only duty that falls under the shadow cabinet's purview; they also have other obligations. In the meanwhile, this is also to provide the opposition the power to carry out the functions of a prospective alternative government. Opposition leaders are able to gain subject matter knowledge, build relationships with a number of stakeholders, appreciate the problems and complexities involved, and design alternative policies that are practicable when they specialize on a single portfolio and focus their attention on a particular issue. A newly elected prime minister is not compelled to appoint members of the shadow cabinet to posts in the actual cabinet; but, they commonly do so, at least initially, in order to make the transition from opposition to government more smooth.

## **Opposition leaders in multiparty parliamentary democracies**

Parliamentary systems, particularly those that follow in the history of continental Europe, may be characterized by several parliamentary parties, reflecting deep socioeconomic cleavages (for instance, socioeconomic

inequalities may be coupled with religious or cultural divisions). This is especially true of parliamentary systems that followed in the history of continental Europe. This is especially true for those people who adhere to the customs of the United Kingdom. In these circumstances, there may be a large number of smaller parties contending for office rather than two large coherent blocs that take turns in power. The formation of a government may include a process of negotiation, with shifting alliances as parties move in and out of coalitions according to the conditions of the political environment. This would be influenced by the conditions of the political environment. Under these conditions, the notion that there is just one person functioning as the head of the opposition is not one that can be tolerated. It is not possible to point to one person as the leader of the opposition; rather, there are several people who are at the helm of separate political groups. The leaders of opposition parties may perform a variety of roles, such as spokespersons for their parties, critics of the government, and potential coalition negotiators; however, they do not necessarily have the same status as the leader of the opposition in a Westminster-model system as a potential prime minister-in-waiting. This is because the leader of the opposition in a Westminster-model system is considered to be the most likely candidate to become the next prime minister of the country. This is due to the fact that under a system modeled after Westminster, the person who is thought to have the highest probability of becoming the next prime minister is the person who leads the opposition. A system of proportional representation could be able to accommodate this event, but having such a system is not a prerequisite for it to actually take place. The fact that there are counterexamples that can be produced on both sides indicates how significant the study of history is. For the majority of the time that it existed, for example, the Third French Republic utilized a majoritarian election system. Despite this, the country was characterized by multiparty politics, precarious coalition governments, and the absence of a leader of the opposition who could be easily identified. Even though both New Zealand and Fiji (currently) use proportional electoral systems, the leader of the main opposition party is still designated as the leader of the opposition in both countries. This is done with the expectation that the person in question will one day serve as prime minister in New Zealand and as prime minister in Fiji.

## **THE CRISIS-RIDDEN OPPOSITION**

The Congress party, the so-called "Mandal" parties, and the Left are the three opposition groups that have found themselves in a state of grave crisis during the current period of BJP rule. This predicament came about as a result of the BJP's rise to power. These several opposing organizations each stand for a distinct ideological domain. Even though these parties had already undergone doctrinal and organizational atrophy before Prime Minister Narendra Modi's administration, the BJP was able to exploit their obvious weaknesses and limit the legacy benefits they had previously enjoyed by taking advantage of those flaws. This was accomplished even though these parties had already experienced theological and organizational atrophy before Prime Minister Narendra Modi's government.

## **THE CONGRESS PARTY**

Let's begin by having a glance at the Congress, shall we? The party has always been seen as representative of the middle ground and of traditionalist nationalism during its entire existence. Nevertheless, beginning in the early 1980s, the area that may be occupied by those who identify as centrist has been rapidly shrinking ever since then. The increasing politicization of caste and the formation of religious cleavages are both occurring at the same time as this trend. In Uttar Pradesh and Bihar, two of the major states in the nation that are located in the Hindi heartland, the Congress party lost support among upper castes to the BJP. Meanwhile, the Congress party lost support among lower castes to the Samajwadi Party (SP) and the Bahujan Samaj Party (BSP), two

caste-based regional parties. Both of these parties are headquartered in the Hindi heartland. As a result, the Congress party was placed in an awkward position between the Mandal movement (which supported backward castes) and the Mandir movement (which supported the Ram temple). As a direct result of these maneuvers, the Congress was reduced to a force that was, for the most part, completely impotent over the vast Gangetic plain.

In the meantime, the mainstream support of Indian nationalism has shifted away from the Congress party and toward the BJP over the course of the previous three decades. The nationalism that evolved in the wake of India's independence from the British had two politically active strands: the developmental nationalism and the unitary nationalism. The Congress was the one responsible for establishing these two aspects of nationalism, and it was the Congress that subsequently employed them for the sake of public legitimacy and electoral mobilization.

The ideology of developmental nationalism may be traced back to the former Prime Minister of India, Jawaharlal Nehru. Nehru portrayed his party as a vanguard that guided the nation-state via a purpose of "collective development." This ideology served as a model for developmental nationalism. Nehru was the embodiment of the developmental nationalist ideology. Dams, steel mills, and other man-made constructions were seen by Nehru to be modern India's equivalent of temples. This concept of a youthful nation racing from abject poverty and social backwardness toward a bright and advanced future was successful in eliciting sentiments of national pride because it depicted a nation on the cusp of great change. The politicians who succeeded Nehru, most notably Indira Gandhi, emphasized the Congress's ownership of unitary nationalism more than Nehru did in her time as prime minister. This is a reference to the claim that the Congress was the only party that could put national interests ahead of issues regarding specific sections of the country. In point of fact, in order to improve the appeal of the Congress party to nationalist feeling, Indira Gandhi regularly stressed the threat presented by separatist organizations in Punjab and Kashmir. This was done in an effort to boost the Congress party's appeal to nationalist emotion. At this moment, that time period seems like a distant memory.

Congress has been unable to rely on large-scale, state-led projects to create feelings of patriotism and pride in the nation ever since the 1990s, when the economy began the process of liberalization. This is because the 1990s marked the beginning of the economic liberalization process. During this same time period, the imperatives of coalition politics forced Congress to bargain and barter with a variety of regional groupings in order to achieve their goals. This happened as a result of the obligatory nature of coalition politics. It was no longer feasible for them to portray themselves as the sole and unwavering champion of the "national interest." The Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) has, throughout this time period, been effective in bridging the gap between the mainstream unitarian nationalism and ethnic nationalism. The securing of anti-Muslim propaganda was a significant factor in enabling this to become a reality. The idea that Muslim radicals from Pakistan and India, two groups that regularly overlap, pose the biggest threat to the nation's security is gaining momentum, particularly among those in the middle classes.

The findings of a survey that was carried out by Lokniti in 2014 provide a significant piece of proof that the nationalist leadership of the BJP is in place. According to the results of the study, Indian citizens place the most trust in the BJP when it comes to matters of national security, while just 19 percent place their faith in the Congress. Comparable surveys carried out in 2019 showed that the margin of victory for the BJP only grew wider.

Is it even somewhat feasible for the Congress to regain the dominant position it held in the past? The fact that nothing positive has taken place over the course of the last eight years does not inspire hope. It has been challenging for the party to build its own brand of nationalism, and it has not been effective in disproving the perception that it takes a more liberal stance on matters relating to the protection of the nation's borders. In order to compete with the BJP's nationalistic program, the Congress party has declared in its platform for the 2019 election that it intends to remove a sedition legislation that dates back to the colonial era (Indian Penal Code Section 124A) as well as a strict military regulation (the Armed Forces Special Powers Act, or AFSPA). The Indian Penal Code includes both of these statutes in its body of legislation. Rahul Gandhi, de facto head of the Congress party, has begun to portray the Congress party's vision of India as a "union of states" more recently. This is in contrast to the unitarian, top-down view of India that is maintained by the BJP. However, the outcomes of these efforts turned out to be less than satisfactory. This objective representation of India as a nation that was formed through compacts and perpetuated by negotiation could be technically accurate, but it woefully lacks any content that has any meaning to India's nationalism in any way, shape, or form. Not only does it pale in comparison to the national vision of the BJP, but it also pales in comparison to the Congress of a bygone era. In other words, the BJP has a national vision that is superior than the Congress.

Even when it comes to matters of secular nationalism, the Congress maintains a certain degree of circumspection. There is no question that there is now taking place in India a movement in the direction of a more majoritarian orientation in terms of popular opinion. On the other side, one might make the case that the Congress has not been effective in building a new vocabulary of secular nationalism that is capable of clearly illustrating how the BJP's politics of division may be harmful to the interests of the country. This is an alternative point of view. During the month of December, gatherings of Hindu fundamentalist seers took place in the holy city of Haridwar, where they then proceeded to give inflammatory lectures aimed against the Muslim minority in the surrounding area. This hateful assembly, which the media referred to as dharam sansads, was condemned by the Congress of the United States. The Congress has also condemned the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) for the recent controversy that has arisen as a result of insulting words made against the Prophet Muhammad. The articulation of secularism by the Congress, on the other hand, is typically limited to reactive and episodic rebuttals of Hindu nationalism, rather than creating a unique and continuous narrative. This is because the Congress prefers to argue against Hindu nationalism in a reactive and episodic manner. In addition, as Yamini Aiyar has pointed out, such secular posturing is devoid of the power of conviction since it is restricted to social media posts and press conferences rather than actual mobilization of people. This is the case because genuine mobilization of people would be more effective.

Nevertheless, this ideological issue is not the fundamental obstacle that is preventing the resuscitation of the Congress. The fact that voters' confidence in the party brand has been diminishing recently is an issue that is much more crucial. The perception that the Congress party is India's natural party of government was the key cause that led to the Congress party's control of the centrist zone in India's political landscape. According to the findings of study carried out in the field of comparative political science, moderate political parties have a higher chance of surviving periods of ideological division if they continue to have their values rooted in reality.<sup>4</sup> This image, on the other hand, was seriously tarnished during the final years of the United Progressive Alliance (UPA) administration (2009–2014), which were characterized by a succession of corruption scandals, economic errors, large-scale protests, intra-party disputes, and policy paralysis. This administration was led by the Congress party. In addition to this, these years were distinguished by a string of terrible occurrences.



Has there been a move, over the course of the previous few years, toward a more upbeat and optimistic attitude in Congress? In response to this inquiry, the unequivocal answer is "no." In the assembly elections that took place earlier this year in Uttarakhand and Goa, which were essentially bipolar struggles between the BJP and the Congress, voters didn't trust the Congress to rule despite the unimpressive performance of the party that was already in power, which was the BJP. These elections were mostly between the BJP and the Congress. The Congress party's administration in the state of Punjab was brought down by charges of widespread corruption as well as bad governance, both of which led to the party's electoral defeat. There are two different courses of action that the Congress may take in the future that will assist improve its reputation. First things first, the party needs to figure out how to solve the ongoing problem with its leadership that is giving the appearance that it is a jumbled mess. Since the defeat of the Democratic Party in the general election that took place in 2019, Congress has not had a president who is elected to serve in a full-time capacity. This is due to the fact that the position is now vacant. As a consequence of the leadership of the Gandhi three, which comprises of Sonia Gandhi and her daughters Rahul and Priyanka Gandhi, there has been an increase in the amount of confusion that surrounds the chains of command. This has resulted in the accountability concept within the party becoming more watered down. Second, the party should build and promote an alternative style of government in the states of Chhattisgarh and Rajasthan, where it still controls power on its own. These states are now under the party's sole control. Both Rajasthan and Chhattisgarh are included in this category.

In the election that took place in 2019, the Congress party was unsuccessful in gaining 171 of the 186 seats when it engaged in a head-to-head contest with the BJP. Therefore, the only realistic prospect of success for the opposition in the near future is for there to be a comeback in electoral fortunes within Congress. This is the case because of the previous point.

## **MANDAL PARTIES**

Because they provide 120 of India's 543 members to Parliament, the Indian states of Uttar Pradesh and Bihar are frequently referred to be the "political heartland" of the nation. This is because Uttar Pradesh is the largest state in India. The phenomenal success that the BJP had in its re-election earlier this year in Uttar Pradesh, when it overcame the SP to become the largest Mandal (backward caste) party in the state, solidified the BJP's position as the most powerful political party in that state. This win solidified the BJP's position as the most powerful political party in that state. The Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) has had what might be described as "relatively modest" levels of success in the neighboring state of Bihar. In spite of this, it has emerged from the most recent election as the most prominent party in Bihar, surpassing both its competitor in the Mandal coalition, the Rashtriya Janata Dal, also known as RJD, as well as its ally in the Mandal alliance, the Janata Dal (United), also known as JD(U).

The Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), which was previously referred to in this article as a "staggeringly effective political machine," is a party that "grinds down and feasts on decaying political spaces." Corruption in the political system of the Mandal had been growing for decades, and the situation was becoming more comparable to that of the Congress. After a number of factional splits that took place in the 1980s and early 1990s in the Hindi heartland, the Yadav community was given leadership of the two biggest Mandal parties in that region. The SP and the RJD are the parties that fall within this category. In the decades that followed, this one dominant caste continued to strengthen its hold over the Mandal region, ultimately smothering it in the process. Because of this, the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) was easily able to break through party barriers by employing its very

own strategy of appealing to members of backward castes, and they made this strategy the main focus of the larger Hindutva movement.

During the election season in Uttar Pradesh, the Socialist Party (SP) changed their name in an effort to undermine the effectiveness of this strategy. The party, which said that it was the "new SP," toned down its rhetoric that was centered on the Yadav caste while simultaneously expanding its outreach to less privileged strata and restating the significance of its socialist roots. The non-Yadav backward caste voters, who collectively make up more than a third of the population, came to the conclusion that this campaign was nothing more than a cosmetic exercise, and as a result, they continued to support the BJP. This was a significant development since these people are vital to the BJP's success.

It was the fourth consecutive electoral triumph for the BJP against the SP in the period of Modi, which also meant that it was the fourth consecutive electoral loss for the SP. In point of fact, once the election results were announced, a large number of political commentators came to the conclusion that the Mandal political system had reached its last stage. Vandita Mishra, an experienced journalist, recently wrote a piece in which she asserted that "Mandal politics is now seen, in large sections of even its home ground, UP [Uttar Pradesh], as casteist and divisive." A political scientist by the name of Pratap Bhanu Mehta stated that the SP placed an excessive amount of reliance on "social arithmetic" rather than a "generative conception of politics." According to his investigation, he stated this. In his subsequent remarks, he said the following: "The project of now opposing any national party on the basis of a coalition of fragmented identities is dead."

It is very clear that the Mandal stock has never been lower than it is right now, and these parties do not have the capability to compete effectively with the BJP. However, a rejuvenated Mandal space may still be a significant political force in the future. Mandal parties need to revise the ideological foundation of their platforms in order to preserve themselves from political obsolescence. This may be accomplished by setting objectives that are still applicable in the modern world. They shouldn't put unnecessary limits on themselves by concentrating only on battles that have already been won, like the campaign for caste quota, for example. In addition, in order for ideological renewal to be regarded as a genuine topic shift rather than a simple electoral gimmick, it must take place outside of political cycles and outside of the sphere of campaign speeches. Only in this way will it be possible for it to be recognized as a true thematic shift.

## Conclusion

The freedom to peacefully gather in groups and to protest in public is of the utmost importance in a democratic system like ours. It is an indication that people are expressing their dissatisfaction with the current state of affairs and calling for changes to be made in the political, economic, and social structures. Protests have the capacity to bring about change not only in the immediate area but also on a global scale. In order to bring about meaningful change in both the policies of the government and the lives of individuals, it has been required to continue efforts over lengthy periods of time. It is absolutely necessary for the rights to engage in peaceful protest to be promoted as well as safeguarded in a state that is governed democratically. However, in accordance with paragraph 2 of Article 19, these rights are qualified by the application of reasonable restrictions. These limitations are imposed through the employment of rules in order to preserve sovereignty, integrity, and public order; the means by which they are carried out are described in the previous sentence. In the absence of any context, the concept of a basic right is meaningless. It is necessary to strike a balance between the right of the protester and the right of the commuter, and the two groups must learn to cohabit in

an environment that is characterized by mutual respect for one another. The Opposition is charged with the primary task of organizing large-scale dharnas, demonstrations, and protests with the goal of applying pressure on the government to provide responses to issues and concerns presented by the general people. This helps to remedy the mistakes that were made by the Ruling Party, and as a consequence, the goal of the opposition parties is largely to restrain the excesses of the party that is now in power and not to be fully hostile toward them. This is because this helps to fix the mistakes that were made by the Ruling Party. Because India has not had a truly prominent opposition leader in recent years, notably in the House of Parliament, the country's capacity to provide constructive criticism of the ruling party has suffered as a result. In the case that there is no serious rival to call into question the government that is now in power, our democracy will suffer as a result of the absence of an alternative. This will make it more difficult for citizens to have their voices heard. In addition, the person who is in charge of the opposition has certain responsibilities that they must do. However, if there isn't any opposition leadership, the opposition won't be able to keep the power of the ruling party in check. Dissent is an important part of the democratic process, hence this is of the utmost importance to ensure that mature democracies function properly. Simple disruptions of meetings and public displays of dissent will not be sufficient to exert the necessary amount of pressure on the government. This kind of pressure will not be able to maintain executive control of the government so long as there is sufficient opposition in the parliament. As a result, in a nutshell, at the very least in theory, the opposition should have a powerful foundation to challenge the administration, and there is a need for a formidable opposition that has a firm dedication to the people. In addition, there is a need for a government that is accountable to the people. It is much more hazardous to have a weak opposition, such as the one that now exists, than it is to have a weak administration. As a result, it is necessary to have a strong opposition in order to guarantee that the democratic system continues to run smoothly.

## Reference

- [1] Kashyap Subash C ( 2013) Parliamentary Procedure- the Law, Privileges, Practices and Precedents (two volumes) Universal Law Publishing Company, New Delhi.
- [2] Yadav Yogendra ,( 2020) Making Sense of Indian Democracy, ( First Edition) Permanent Black, New Delhi.
- [3] 3.Das Ranjan Kumar ( 2021) Indian Democracy in 21st century, Abhijeet Publications, New Delhi.
- [4] Kohli Atul ( 2015) The Success of India's Democracy, Cambridge University Press.
- [5] Baru Sanjaya ( 2014) The Accidental Prime Minister, Penguin Random z House India, New Delhi.
- [6] Pradeep Chhibber and Rahul Verma, "The Rise of the Second Dominant Party System in India: BJP's New Social Coalition in 2019," *Studies in Indian Politics* 7, no. 2 (2019): 131–148.
- [7] Ziegfeld, "A New Dominant Party in India? Putting the 2019 BJP Victory Into Comparative and Historical Perspective," *India Review* 19, no. 2 (2020): 136–152.
- [8] Farooqui and E. Sridharan, "Can Umbrella Parties Survive? The Decline of the Indian National Congress," *Commonwealth & Comparative Politics* 54, no. 3 (2016): 331–361.
- [9] R. Johns and A. K. Kölln, "Moderation and Competence: How a Party's Ideological Position Shapes Its Valence Reputation," *American Journal of Political Science* 64, no. 3 (2020): 649–663.