India’s States: The Struggle to Govern

James Manor

Shri Neeraj Kumar: Asian Development Research Institute is celebrating its Silver Jubilee year during 2016-17. On behalf of the Institute, I welcome you to the curtain raiser event of our Silver Jubilee celebrations. This event is a special lecture by Professor James Manor. We would be organizing three international conferences as part of our Silver Jubilee celebrations next year. Before we begin the program, may I invite our distinguished guests of today to kindly come on the dais and take a seat: Honorable former Chief Minister of Bihar Shri Laloo Prasad ji, Honorable Chair of today’s program, Professor Pratap Bhanu Mehta, Professor James Manor, ADRI’s Member-Secretary Dr. Shaibal Gupta ji, our Director Professor Prabhat P. Ghosh and administrator, Dr. Sunita Lal. I think we will get enough of opportunities for pictures. Let’s begin the session, please. I would now request Dr. Shaibal Gupta ji to kindly deliver the Welcome Address. Thank you.

Dr. Shaibal Gupta: Shri Laloo Prasad ji, former Chief Minister and Union Minister and architect of Mahagathbandhan victory, Mr. Bijendra Yadav ji, Sushil Kumar Modi ji, Purve ji, Professor James Manor, Prabhat Ghosh, Sunita Lal, enlightened intelligentsia of Patna, friends from electronic and print media, ladies and gentlemen: The Asian Development Research Institute, as you might know, is now one of the leading social science research institutes in our part of the country. In 1991, when the social science research in the country was trying to negotiate a critical phase, ADRI had ventured to establish itself as an institution and shared the responsibility of social science research. ADRI has ensured that this task remains fully geared towards addressing the country’s development challenges with special reference to Bihar. We have now completed 25 years of our eventful existence and have planned our Silver Jubilee celebrations in 2016-17. Among our achievements, we may underline that we have worked during the last 25 years on a number of social issues, not just to unravel the social dynamics in Bihar and India but to equip the government with new, evidence-based ideas. ADRI has played a critical role by suggesting various governance changes to achieve the desired result. Thematically, these studies, numbering more than 150, have spanned the area of human development, regional economics, public finance, and political economy of development, evaluation studies and other related areas. In addition, ADRI has also conducted a large number of large-scale surveys to provide authentic information base on important social phenomena.
While some of these studies were sponsored by external agencies, many of them were undertaken as self-sponsored research by ADRI. It is, therefore, not surprising that two important centers have been established at ADRI, first the Center for Economic Policy and Public Finance, CEPPF, by the state government and second one of the International Growth Center, sponsored by LSE and Oxford, funded by DFID of the UK government. Since 2007, the CEPPF has been providing the state government with professional support for financial governance, including the preparation of the Annual Economic Survey of Bihar. The IGC, on the other hand, has a mandate to support the state government through its extensive program of demand-based research. Earlier, too, impressed by ADRI’s research output, the National Literacy Mission had established two centers at the Institute: the State Resource Center for Adult Education in 1995 and Jan Shikshan Sansthan in 2000. Later on, the NLM has entrusted the responsibility of establishing SRC for Jharkhand and Ranchi in 2004. In view of this tangible and sustained academic performance, it was again not surprising ... the Council of Social Science Research formally recognized our achievement and listed ADRI as one of its recognized institutes. Our Silver Jubilee celebrations are planned to have a number of events which are going to strengthen the governance agenda. The core of this celebration will be three Silver Jubilee conferences where ideas and experience will be exchanged to advocate a good governance system. The first of this is the conference on Development: experience and theories which is planned to be a summative exercise on the trajectory of development in developing countries across the world and how it has informed the theorizing efforts of the scholars. The second conference is planned to focus on social statistics in India, an area of concern for both scholars and administrators who are in need of more authentic data on various social issues. This conference is in honor of Dr P P Ghosh, who is sitting on the dais. Lastly, the third conference, in the memory of late Arvind Narain Das, is centered on Bihar and Jharkhand: shared history to shared vision which would deliberate on the complex realities of the two states encompassing their ... and polity on one hand and aspiration and challenges on the other. We intend to assemble the best minds on these issues from across the world to extend our present frontier of knowledge. For the parallel Silver Jubilee lectures, we are inviting outstanding social scientists of international fame to speak on the subject of their choice. Today, we are raising the curtain on year-long celebration with a lecture by Professor James Manor. Professor Manor needs no introduction for an audience like this. He is among just a few luminaries who have studied India for about four decades. Currently, he is associated with the Institute of Commonwealth Studies, University of London. I am thankful to him for sparing some time for today’s Lecture. I would also like to mention here that another luminary is presiding over today’s session and he is Professor Pratap Bhanu Mehta. Professor Mehta is currently heading the Center for Policy Research, New Delhi. Both are personally known to me for many years. Professor Manor was responsible for my Sussex fellowship way back in late 90s. The concept of Cockney elite, apart from traditional and vernacular elite, in the Indian context was indeed developed under his tutelage. Both Professor Manor and Professor Mehta have been big academic patrons for us. I am personally grateful to both of them. We are extremely happy that Shri Laloo Prasad ji, our
former Chief Minister and Union Minister, is with us on this momentous occasion of our history. When we started ADRI in 1991, he was the Chief Minister of the state. During his entire tenure, he had given us patronage and support to the maximum. He is one of the few people in the country who have upheld the torch of secularism and social inclusion without faltering. Who can give us a better autobiographical insight of Bihar’s struggle to govern than Shri Laloo Prasad ji? The future is much more imponderable, the two different electoral mandates, nationally and provincially, but I am looking forward to his reassertion on this front. What can be better for us for a discourse on governance ... foremost theorists of governance and an outstanding practitioner who had actually governed the most difficult state of the country sharing the dais today? I am sure today’s discussion will be one of the best in the annals of academic discourse of Patna. With these words, I welcome you all once again to this curtain raiser lecture by Professor James Manor on India’s states: The struggle to govern. We are eagerly waiting for this lecture. Thank you.

Shri Neeraj Kumar: I would now request our colleague, Shri Suraj Shankar, to present a bouquet to Honorable former Chief Minister Shri Laloo Prasad ji. I will also request our colleague Dr. Amit Bakshi ji to present a bouquet to Honorable Chair of today’s program Professor Pratap Bhanu Mehta. I will also request our colleague Dr. Barna Ganguli ji to present a bouquet to Professor James Manor. Thank you, Dr Bakshi, Dr Ganguli and Shri Suraj Shankar. May I now request Dr. Sunita Lal ji to kindly introduce our guests to the audience?

Dr. Sunita Lal: Professor Pratap Bhanu Mehta, President of the gathering, Professor James Manor, our distinguished speaker, Ghosh da, Shaibal da, ladies and gentlemen: Introducing three luminaries in one meeting is a formidable task. All of them have distinguished themselves in setting an agenda in their respective fields. However, it is my proud privilege to do so. Shri Laloo Prasad ji had set the social justice and secular agenda of Bihar and ensured the process of democratization in this part of the world. It was not a mean achievement to give voice to the people of Bihar, basically a feudal state. In any case, introducing Laloo Prasad ji to the Patna audience is tantamount to exporting coal to New Castle. He came from a subaltern family of Gopalganj and joined Patna University. After his election as the President of the Student Union, he never looked back. From being a member of the legislative assembly to a Member of Parliament to Chief Minister of Bihar to a Union Minister of the central government, he created a distinguished space for himself. Very recently, he played a decisive role in the victory of the Mahagathbandhan in the state elections. His principle contribution to the country is setting the agenda of the social justice and secularism without which it is impossible to visualize an India of peace and prosperity. Professor Pratap Bhanu Mehta and Professor James Manor again need no introduction to the world of academics. Both at Harvard University, incidentally after Professor Manor had taught Indian politics at Harvard University for years, this prestigious academic responsibility was taken over by Professor Mehta. Even otherwise, both these scholars have collaborated on many joint academic agenda. Professor Mehta, President and Chief Executive Officer at the Center for Policy Research in New Delhi, is a political scientist who has also
taught at the Jawaharlal Nehru University and the New York University School of Law. His areas of research include political theory, constitutional law, society and politics in India, governance and political economy and international affairs. Dr. Mehta has served on many central government committees including India’s National Security Advisory Board, the Prime Minister’s National Knowledge Commission and the Supreme Court-appointed Committee on elections in Indian Universities. He is a prolific writer. He is an editorial consultant to the “Indian Express” and his columns have appeared in dailies including “The Financial Times”, “The Telegraph”, “The International Herald Tribune”, and “The Hindu”. He is also on the editorial Boards of many academic journals, including “The American Political Science Review”, “The Journal of Democracy”, and “India and Global Affairs”. Dr. Mehta had graduated in Philosophy, Politics, and Economics from the envious Oxford University and obtained his PhD in politics from the equally envious Princeton University. He received the 2010 Malcolm S. Adisheshiah Award and the 2011 Infosys Prize for Social Science and Political Science. He is one of the few academics of the country who is not only setting the academic agenda but also greatly influencing the political agenda in the country. Professor James Manor is the Emeka Anyaoku Professor Emeritus of Commonwealth Studies in the School of Advanced Studies, University of London. He has previously taught at Yale, Harvard and Leicester Universities, at the Institute of Development Studies in Sussex, and at the Institute for Social and Economic Change, Bengaluru. His most recent books, both from Orient Black Swan are “Politics and State-Society Relations in India: Collected Writings” and with Rob Jenkins, “Politics and the Right to Work: The Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act”. Professor Manor has worked as a Consultant for the Ford Foundation, the World Bank, the Swedish International Development Agency, the United Nations Capital Development Fund, the UNDP, the Netherlands Ministry of Education, SNV, GTZ, the Norwegian Aid Agency, the DFID of UK, the World Economic Forum, and the OECD. Professor Manor has acted as an Advisor to the governments of Bangladesh, Columbia, and Zambia, and to the Prime Minister’s Office in India, the Commonwealth Secretariat, The British Council and The British Foreign and Commonwealth Office. He has been a member of the Board of Trustees of the International Records Management Trust and the Institute of Commonwealth and of Latin American Studies, University of London. He sits on the Editorial Boards of four journals in Britain, the US and India. Since 1994, Professor Manor has been a Senior Associate of Cambridge Energy Research Associates in Boston, specializing in governance and the energy sector in South Asia, and in mid-1990s he worked with the Secretary-General of Amnesty International to establish a joint AI/University of London Master of Arts. Now, you will be treated with the first ADRI Silver Jubilee Curtain Raiser Lecture by Professor James Manor. Welcome.

**Professor Pratap Bhanu Mehta:** Honorable Shri Laloo Prasad ji, Shaibal Gupta ji, James Manor, Sushil Modi ji, distinguished citizens of Patna: Bq[s; g[ak [Ms[lg]se FtkM] l k y x j g[A fcg[kj ead 1bZHh pp Zgk h gSv k[fcg[kj dsfok ead 1bZHh pp Zgk h gSrksml eat kx g]1bZ
Professor James Manor:
I want to thank ADRI for inviting me to lift the curtain on its Silver Jubilee celebrations. This is a great honor and I am grateful for the invitation. I visited ADRI when it was beginning, long ago, and I am very happy to see that it has gone from strength to strength. People across India and overseas now know how very important ADRI is and they come here whenever they possibly can. I should apologize for not speaking Hindi. I do not speak Hindi. I speak Kannada but that is no help. That would be worse than English but I
should say that in 45 years of studying in Karnataka, I have never seen a meeting like this which has been attended by very distinguished figures from both sides of the political spectrum: Laloo Prasad ji, Sushil Modi ji and numerous others including the current Finance Minister. This is a great tribute to the, it is an indication of the seriousness ... Bihar about these things and also it is a great tribute to ADRI. I will talk about state governments and Chief Ministers but I will say almost nothing about Bihar, almost. I think there is one comment. This is a talk about other states and their governments. Now, there are 101 things to say about state governments in India and I will talk about only a few things but I think they are important. A fundamental change in the Indian political system happened between 1989 and 2014 when no party could form a majority in the Lok Sabha. There was a very big redistribution of power at the national level away from the Prime Minister’s Office, which had been dominant under Indira and Rajiv Gandhi during the period before 1989. Power flowed to other institutions after 1989, other institutions at the national level, but also to parties and to governments at the state level. Two other important changes in the last twenty years have also occurred. First of all, power within many but not all state governments in India, power has been greatly centralized. Now, this is the opposite of the trend which we saw between ’89 and 2014 at the national level. At the national level, we saw the decentralization of power. At the state level in many states, we have seen the centralization of power. As a result also of these changes, of these differences, we see that variations and differences between state governments in different parts of the country have grown greater. States are less like each other today than they were 20 years ago and as a result of this, the Indian state, as ordinary people experience it, takes different shapes across India ... The power will come back, one minute... I will talk here about the thinking and the actions of top politicians, mainly Chief Ministers. They have too little attention in the work of social scientists, many social scientists and this is a mistake because Chief Ministers and their senior colleagues usually make the most important decisions about how the states will be governed. I think that’s obvious. When social scientists ignore Chief Ministers and their close colleagues, what they give us is Hamlet without the Prince and that’s a serious matter because it leaves us without a full understanding. Some social scientists, mainly the economists, claim that top politicians are locked into something called path dependency. They mean that top politicians must stick to the paths set by previous governments and they cannot innovate. This is also a mistake. Many Chief Ministers in India have innovated a lot. M.G. Ramachandran in Tamil Nadu, Rama Krishna Hegde in Karnataka, Mr. Shekhawat in Rajasthan, Jyoti Basu, Digvijay Singh, Raj Shekhar Reddy and of course, Laloo Prasad and Nitish Kumar. Notice that the people in this list come from many different parties. This is a general trend. It is a trend that cuts across party lines. Let us start with the redistribution of power between 1989 and 2014 at the national level away from the Prime Minister’s Office. That’s a period of 25 years. Now, you know that since 2014, since the Parliamentary election, we have a party with a majority in the Lok Sabha and we have a Prime Minister who is energetic and centralized but in those 25 years, between ’89 and 2014, many things changed. It is a long time and those changes will not quickly go away. Before 1989, Indira and Rajiv Gandhi, often abused their powers, and they weakened nearly all
important institutions in the political system. Government institutions were weakened and strangely, Mrs. Gandhi even weakened the institution which was her own party organization because she saw it as a threat ... She did these ... when this tendency continued under Rajiv Gandhi. But after 1989, many of those institutions which were damaged by the centralizing Gandhis, but not the Congress Party, many of these institutions regained power and as a result, they were partly rebuilt. I am thinking of Parliament, its Committees, the Courts, the Election Commission, and many other institutions at the national level but also the federal system and state governments in India. All were rebuilt and re-empowered between ’89 and 2014. Now, those institutions stopped Prime Ministers in that period from abusing their power so that between ’89 and 2014, I can think of only one time or maybe two when an Indian Prime Minister abused his power which was much less than before 1989. By the way, it is much less than Britain experienced, much less abuse of power than Britain experienced under either Margaret Thatcher or Tony Blair. They abused powers much more than Indian Prime Ministers did in that period. I once told a Parliamentary Committee in the House of Commons this. They didn’t like it but it’s true. In many, though not all, states, however, as power was decentralized at the national level, it was centralized within the state governments. In mid-2014, I calculated that about 60% of Indians lived in states where the Chief Minister either completely dominated the government or nearly dominated the political system. The percentages in that calculation change over time as governments change and as Chief Ministers change but the centralization theme is constant throughout. Before I talk about how power gets decentralized in many state governments, let’s look at one other important change since 2003 in India. This is the great increase in state and central government revenues since 2003. Before 2003, even as economic growth increased, revenues did not rise much. So, many state governments faced crippling financial problems. Most Chief Ministers found that these problems forced them to lose elections, not to be reelected. In interviews that I have had, several interviews, former Chief Ministers of Indian states who held power before 2003 speak sadly about how much more they could have achieved if they had more money, if they had the kind of money that their successors have. I can remember Digvijay Singh saying to me, “If only I had the money that Shivraj Singh Chauhan has, I could have done much more,” and Shivraj Singh Chauhan has more money because beginning in 2003, revenues shot up strongly and this trend continues even in years when economic growth slips down and it continues to the present day. So, that means that Chief Ministers of state governments today have many times more money to spend than they did in 2002. Now, this has greatly helped these Chief Ministers to remain popular and it has helped their parties to win reelections. Between 1980 and December 2008, state governments were thrown out by voters at about 70% of the time. That’s a huge number of rejections for state governments between ’80 and 2008. Now, if we take West Bengal out of that calculation because the government kept getting reelected in West Bengal, the number of governments thrown out by voters gets close to 90%. Internationally, these are extremely high rejection rates for governments and this terrified Chief Ministers but since 2008, December, state governments have tended to be reelected much more often than before, thanks partly to the increased
revenues. Now, let’s talk a little bit about how power in many states is centralized. How does it happen? Two sets of actions or devices are used by centralizing Chief Ministers. Not all Chief Ministers are centralizing but those who are centralizing tend to use two sets of different actions. One set of actions is legitimate and legal and the other set of actions is illegal. Let’s talk about the legal, legitimate devices first. Because of greater revenues, Chief Ministers can create new programs and increase spending on existing programs to cultivate popularity. The three sets of legitimate devices, legitimate ways of spending money and creating programs are available to Chief Ministers. First of all, some of them turn to populism, by which I mean subsidies on goods and services and also, giveaways. Chief Ministers who centralize power usually associate themselves personally with these schemes. An example of a subsidy is Shivraj Singh Chauhan’s Special Fund in Madhya Pradesh to provide grain at reduced prices. When giveaways are made, centralizing Chief Ministers often personally give away goodies meant for beneficiaries with cameras present, like this. As for example, when Mr. Karunanidhi in Tamil Nadu gave away many, many color television sets to people in front of cameras and the television. Chandrababu Naidu would send personal letters to all voters to tell them of the subsidies and the giveaways that he was providing as the first kind of, the first way they can spend their extra money. The second way is to distribute patronage. Funds go to patrons in the ruling party. The patrons pass those funds along to clients to get their loyalty. The clients often have their own clients below them and they give, pass the money down and the party is supposed to get loyalty from much of different people as a result of patronage distribution. Patronage is only partly passed out to get votes. It has another use. Patronage distribution may also be used to bring order to party organizations which are often very weak and disorderly. What happens is the patronage is handed out by party leaders to the next rank in the party that is supposed to bring them under control, get them to behave themselves and their further distribution of patronage is supposed to have the same effect on people below them. In recent years, however, many Chief Ministers have become increasingly unhappy with patronage distribution because it is not really politically effective. It is not enough to distribute patronage in order to win elections. Something else is needed. These leaders see that most Chief Ministers lost the elections between 1980 and 2008 when they depended upon patronage. This happened partly because their party organizations were so undisciplined that they could not distribute patronage effectively. Subordinates in their party just stole the money, put it in their pockets and that was the end of it, and patronage also sometimes goes to the wrong people so that the targeted groups don’t receive enough to maintain their loyalty and patronage. Above all, patronage cannot keep peace with the rising demands from people in society. As a result of all these problems with patronage distribution, many Chief Ministers have increasingly used a third strategy when they spend their money. They have increasingly, right across India, used programmatic efforts, new government programs to deliver goods and services and to promote development, programs which are not vulnerable. They are protected from patronage waffles. These programs mainly work through the bureaucracy. They mainly use the bureaucracy in order to make these programs go. That is a better choice, they think, than weak and disorderly party organizations. Centralizing Chief Ministers dominate the
bureaucracy and the management of these programs and they deny MLAs power over these programs just as they deny MLAs powers over transfers, which are often used to be profitable for MLAs. So, power is centralized in the system in this way. Many new programs have come up in India, right across India, in recent times. New insurance and pension schemes, scholarships, ambulances, health care programs, new schools, road improvements, water harvesting, irrigation schemes, agriculture extension schemes, etc. All of these things, of course, have some developmental impact. This is a major trend in India and it has had a hugely positive effect on development and social justice. Centralizing Chief Ministers identify themselves personally with these schemes as I said before. Now, to succeed in making these schemes work, in making these programs work, a Chief Minister has to be intelligent and he has to be or she has to be a skilled administrator and a skilled political operator. Not all Chief Ministers are intelligent or skilled. Some are too autocratic so that they destroy their governments, to give you two examples. Ajit Jogi in Chhattisgarh, and Vasundhara Raje in her first term as the Chief Minister of Rajasthan, both over-centralized unwisely and wrecked their governments. They were thrown out at the first opportunity. Some other Chief Ministers, like Mr. Yeddyurappa in Karnataka, are too stupid to make these projects work but, more often, most of the time, centralizing Chief Ministers and other Chief Ministers have been more skillful and more able to make these programs work and so, they tend strongly to win elections. Centralizing Chief Ministers make use of all these legal devices that I have been talking about. They also make use of certain illegal devices and we have to talk about that too. Economic growth and high prices for land and raw materials and minerals have created opportunities in many Indian states for industrialists to make huge profits, not least in mining, but India’s economic liberalization has been cautious and limited, limited by international standards. India’s economic system is far short of being neo-liberal. Whatever you may read in the papers and in academic studies, this system is not neo-liberal. It has many things in it which neo-liberals hate. One of the things that neo-liberals, I am not a neo-liberal by the way; I am just telling you what they think, neo-liberals hate it when politicians keep a lot of discretionary power to give permission to, for example, industrialists, to do things, to do any projects and Chief Ministers, centralizing Chief Ministers, not all but some have taken advantage of this and extracted massive illicit, illegal contributions from industrialists in exchange for licenses and permissions. One Chief Minister, for example, a well-known Chief Minister demanded and received bribes from industrialists of more than one million dollars on more than 100 occasions each time. That’s serious money and he is no exception. Illicit contributions like this usually go directly to the Chief Minister so they have much more money than other politicians in their parties and in their states and they are able to use this money to gather power into their own hands. The main targets for the illicit money are not voters. Voters cannot be bought. The main targets are other politicians. Some subordinates in the ruling party may need to be supported. Other members of the ruling party may be undisciplined and have to be denied money by the Chief Minister. Politicians in rival parties can sometimes be induced into restraining themselves with a little money and money can also be used to undermine rivals in other parties and their networks and support. I will say a little more
about this in a moment. Some, but certainly not all centralizing Chief Ministers, also develop links to organized crime, partly to raise more money and partly to get some muscle power. Some Chief Ministers even help the criminal underworld to reach into booming urban centers. For example, South India in the early 1980s, in South India, there was only one city which had a serious organized crime problem. It was not Chennai, Hyderabad or Bangalore. It was Vijayawada in Andhra Pradesh. Today, all four of those cities and all other cities in South India are afflicted by organized crime, partly because criminals have sometimes been helped by politicians. That’s truer in one state than in the other three. It is truer of Andhra Pradesh than the other three South Indian states. Other devices, apart from the illegal ones, other devices are also used in the struggle to govern by Chief Ministers. You know about some of these but I will simply discuss three. First: Chief Ministers sometimes use co-optation, intimidation and coercion. Centralizing Chief Ministers may use favors and inducements to co-opt important actors and groups. They may use intimidation and threats to get people to do things or not to do things and some Chief Ministers use coercion, physical force, to intimidate adversaries. Centralizing Chief Ministers are also sometimes hostile to and try to dominate what we call alternative power centers. Chief Ministers often try to, are hostile to and try to dominate the media or civil society but also, they have the same approach to formal institutions of state which are alternatives to executive power. They often put pressure on the state assembly and try to dominate it, the Courts, the Police and the Intelligence Bureau, Lok Ayuktas and regulatory agencies and state corporations and Governors and bureaucracies and Panchayati Raj institutions and so on. I should say, by the way, that there is a perfectly legitimate way, perfectly legal way of inducing legislators from opposition parties to behave themselves if you are a Chief Minister but I will come to that in a moment. The second thing I would like to mention is the business of dividing and uniting at the same time. It is a very delicate, tricky game. Chief Ministers seek to unite as many social groups behind them as possible and to divide those groups who are against them. Identity politics come into play and here, I think, I can make my one comment on Bihar. Biharis know all about dividing and uniting in this way because it is a major trend in Bihar’s recent political history. So, I will not explain this. The rest of my comments are, as with my previous comments, are not about Bihar. I am not giving you a, some kind of a disguised message about Bihar in this discussion. Finally, let me talk of... make a few comments on how centralizing Chief Ministers use their massive power and especially their massive money which they have. Voters cannot be bought. So, Chief Ministers use their money to do other things. First, they help candidates from their parties to run lavish election campaigns. You know all about this from the recent one. In one recent state election, not Bihar, in one recent state election, a man who had little political experience, he was a retired school Principal, was put by the Chief Minister, was put in charge of handling campaign money for the ruling party in one section of the state, one-third of this state and when the money arrived, the school Principal was astonished and shocked to see how much money, vast amounts of money he had to give out and in reaction, he was so shocked he had a heart attack and had to be taken to hospital. To buy off, another thing money is used for is to buy off key leaders in rival parties as elections approach.
For example, before the 2008 state election in Karnataka, Mr. Yeddyurappa used money, massive money from mining interests in the state to make huge payments to key Congress Party leaders in 20 different districts. That’s almost all the districts of the state. What he did was to use the money to cripple the Congress’s organization. So, the Congress leaders sat at home during the campaign and Mr. Yeddyurappa won that election. Another thing that can be done is to induce legislators and activists from opposition parties to behave in a nice way toward the ruling party inside and outside the state assembly. There are perfectly legal ways to do this, by the way, and the most skilled man at this game was Mr. Shekhawat, Chief Minister of Rajasthan. What Shekhawat, soon after he was elected Chief Minister, called in one by one each MLA from the Congress Party, the opposition party and he said to each one, “Please give me a list of the 10 things that your constituency needs in order of preference from the most important to the least important.” So the Congress MLAs will write down 10 things their constituency needs and handed the list to the Chief Minister, the BJP Chief Minister. He then said, he looked at the list, he said, “OK, I can do the first three things or the first four things in the list. I can do that very simply. No problem. The other six things in your list, well, I might be able to help you but that will depend on how you behave in the state assembly and whether you cause me trouble outside.” There is nothing illegal about this and it worked quite well. He had a very peaceful time in that term of office. Money and power can also be used to induce legislators from opposition parties to defect, to resign their seats and seek reelection on the ruling party’s ticket. This is what Mr. Yeddyurappa did in Karnataka in order to get himself a majority after one close election. Money can also be used to induce candidates from small parties or from key caste groups to conduct energetic election campaigns in constituencies where they will take votes away from the ruling party’s candidates. You know about this, I think, but the details are sort of interesting. Sometimes, in some states, rebel candidates are simply given a bit of money to pay for their election expenses with a little bit extra on top but in one state, this practice was developed into a fine art. Rebel candidates of this kind were told that if they gained a certain number of votes, they would receive a further payment, an extra payment after the election as a reward on top of the first payment. In that state, a party adopted what was called a “One plus Two” approach. Some of you may have heard of this. The “One plus Two” approach is where the party, the ruling party would pay a rebel candidate a certain amount of money if the opposition candidate in that constituency was defeated. Then the rebel candidate would be given twice as much money, “one plus two”, as a reward. Now, the other party fighting that election heard about this and they thought about trying to use a “one plus three” model to counteract this business to keep the rebel candidates at home. But then they decided, “No, we won’t do “one”. We won’t do this and they lost the election. Let me please stress and please do not misunderstand my comments here. I firmly believe that India is a strong and a very genuine democracy. It has many virtues, great virtues and it is a privilege to study it. It has, for example, a federal system in which state governments have done many more constructive things for development and for social justice than any other federal system in the world, except maybe
Brazil. This is a remarkable achievement but to understand India's democracy and all of its good features, we also need to pay attention to some of these complications. Thank you.

Professor Pratap Bhanu Mehta: Thank you, Professor Manor, for those wonderful reflections on the inner workings of India's democracy. I think it is a great privilege for us and this is such a unique intellectual occasion. As Shikharji was saying that after political scientists talk about the workings of Indian democracy, we have one of the great practitioners of Indian politics and one of its great leaders, Shri Laloo Prasad Yadav, who will in a sense reflect on lessons for governance from his own experiences.
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Professor Prabhat P Ghosh: Respected Shri Laloo Prasad ji, our Chief Guest this afternoon, Professor Pratap Bhanu Mehta, President of the gathering, Professor James Manor, our distinguished speaker, and ladies and gentlemen: At the end of this excellent discourse, one of the most challenging dimensions of state politics in India, it is my proud privilege to propose a sincere vote of thanks. During the next year or so, we have plans to celebrate our Silver Jubilee Year with a number of seminars and lectures. This lecture, as Dr. Gupta said already, is our curtain raiser event. I, for one, would think that this event has been as splendid as we had hoped it would be. We are grateful to many distinguished dignitaries for this enlightening event. To begin with, I first express my deepest gratitude to Shri Laloo Prasad ji for gracing this occasion as our Chief Guest. In the past, there have been several occasions where he was kind enough to attend our function and encourage us. I particularly remember one of his addresses on adult education in the late 90s, right in the ADRI premises, which had concluded with the words “padho ya maro”. Either be educated or be prepared to die. It was later used as an extremely effective slogan for promoting adult education campaign in Bihar, laying the foundation for social empowerment in the state. Sir, we are thankful to you for your kind support you have given us all these years. Friends, I would now like to thank Professor Pratap Bhanu Mehta for presiding over this curtain raising lecture. Those of us who are familiar with Dr. Mehta’s writing would know that he not only writes on a variety of social and political issues in India but does so with the utmost rigor using extremely inter-disciplinary framework. It was indeed a privilege for us to have him here amongst us this afternoon and his sincere remark, previous remark that he made on the political discourse in India was also extremely useful. As our main speaker, we had this afternoon Professor James Manor, owner of an astounding mind which had tried to unravel the intricacies of politics in present day world. We are grateful that India occupies a huge space in his academic canvas and, of course, for this lecture this afternoon. As social scientists, many of us are eager to read foreign authors, not because they are foreigners but because they have one additional advantage of taking a detached look of the problems that India faces. I think Professor
Manor has leveraged that detachment most effectively to give us some of the most outstanding understanding of Indian politics. We are grateful to him for this lecture. In our forthcoming Silver Jubilee lectures and seminars, we will try our best to maintain the standard that he has set for us this afternoon. Friends, in the audience, I see a number of dignitaries who are all present here to attend the Lecture and encourage us. On my own behalf and on behalf of ADRI, let me give thanks to all of them, particularly Shri Abdul Bari Siddiqui ji, Shri Bijendra Prasad ji, Shri Sushil Modi ji, Srimati Anita Devi, Shri Abdul Ghafoor ji, Shri Ram Chandra Purve ji, Shri Mundrika rai Yadav ji, Shri Uday Narain Chaudhry ji, Dr. Ruchira Gupta, Shri Anoop Mukherjee, Shri Rameshwar Singh, Shri Manoj Srivastava, Sri Sanjay Kumar and Dr. Abdul ... To all others in the audience, we are all very grateful for being with us this afternoon. To members of the Press, both print and electronic, I extend my sincere thanks and hope that you accord adequate coverage of this splendid event. Let me conclude this Thanksgiving by remembering my colleagues at ADRI who have all worked hard to make this session a success. Thank you once again.
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