

Populism in Indian Politics: An Analysis

Kethapaka Prasad

Research Scholar, Department of Political Science, Kakatiya University, Warangal, Telangana.

Introduction

In the past few decades, populism as a political phenomenon in India has attracted a lot of attention. By carefully appealing to the emotions of the general public and portraying itself as a counterforce to the governing class, populism has had a huge impact on India's political environment. This phenomenon is a notable and persistent feature of Indian politics since it transcends traditional ideological divisions. This phenomenon's beginnings and persistence have provoked heated debates among academics, politicians, and the general public, prompting a thorough analysis of its trends, fundamental causes, and consequences.

Populism has become a prominent aspect of modern Indian politics, profoundly influencing public debate, electoral tactics, and policy-making. In India, populism, which is typified by appeals to "the people" against alleged elites, is not confined to a single ideology or political party but rather has spread throughout the country, impacting political mobilization and governance. The origins of populist politics in India may be found in the post-independence period, when political figures mobilized widespread support by promising social justice, land reforms, and welfare programs. Populism has changed over time, mirroring coalition politics, regional dynamics, and the emergence of charismatic leaders. Bypassing typical party structures and institutional channels, parties are increasingly using symbolic gestures, large-scale demonstrations, and emotive tales to establish direct relationships with the voters. Additionally, modern populism makes use of digital media channels to spread messages, develop customized political branding, and interact in real time with sizable audiences. There are several factors contributing to populism in India. Socio-economic inequality, regional disparities, unemployment, and agrarian distress create fertile ground for populist appeals. Cultural and identity-based factors, including caste, religion, and regional sentiment, further intensify populist mobilization. Charismatic leadership plays a crucial role in framing political narratives, while media—both traditional and digital—acts as a multiplier, shaping public perception and influencing electoral outcomes. Populist rhetoric often simplifies complex policy issues into moral binaries, presenting leaders as the champions of the "common people" against a corrupt or disconnected elite. The consequences of populism are both significant and complex. On the one hand, populist measures can enhance political participation, increase attention to neglected social groups, and provide immediate relief through welfare schemes. On the other hand, populist governance may prioritize short-term electoral gains over long-term economic and institutional stability, leading to fiscal strain, policy inconsistency, and challenges to democratic norms. Populist communication strategies, emphasizing emotive appeals and personality-driven politics, may undermine deliberative policymaking and critical public debate.

There is not a single, comprehensive definition of populism. This tendency includes politicians who portray themselves as defenders of underrepresented groups, so drawing attention to a stark contrast with a governing class that is either self-serving or morally flawed. It is common practice to employ language intended to evoke strong emotions in order to achieve this goal, such as promises of significant change and appeals to patriotism. Populist leaders may construct their arguments based on the dichotomy between "the people" and "the establishment," using the former as a handy contrast to the latter. The emergence of populism in India's political realm may be attributed to a range of characteristics stemming from the nation's historical, economic, and societal contexts. Following India's attainment of independence, the Indian National Congress emerged as the preeminent political entity. Over the course of time, however, the establishment of this hegemonic dominance resulted in the emergence of a power vacuum that was subsequently filled by other political parties.

The implementation of economic liberalisation measures in 1991 marked the beginning of a period characterised by robust economic progress. The presence of discontentment among certain demographics may be attributed to the emergence of disparities as an unintended consequence of this phenomenon. These disparities provided an opportunity for populist politicians to capitalise on them. The success of populism in India is influenced by several factors, including identity, caste, religion, and regionalism. The combination of several circumstances, including the emergence of mass media and the widespread use of social media, has provided populist leaders with unparalleled opportunities to engage with and rally their followers. The electorate in India exhibits a susceptibility to the allure of 'anti-establishment' personalities, hence contributing to the growing appeal of populist political movements.

Consequences of Populism

The growth of populism, which has many political, economic, and social ramifications, has become a defining characteristic of Indian politics. These impacts are complex, creating both opportunities and difficulties for social cohesiveness, democratic governance, and policy-making. To evaluate the total effect of populism on India's political and socioeconomic landscape, it is essential to comprehend these repercussions.

Enhanced Political Participation:

The participation of historically underrepresented or underprivileged populations is one of the most obvious advantages of populist politics. Populist leaders promote increased voter turnout and political participation by portraying politics as a direct conversation between the "people" and the elite. Communities that were previously marginalized by mainstream politics are frequently empowered by this greater involvement, enhancing the democratic process' inclusivity.

Policy Focus on Welfare:

Large-scale welfare programs, subsidies, and programs targeted at providing immediate socioeconomic relief are often given top priority by populist regimes. For instance, under populist leadership, initiatives aimed at women's welfare, inexpensive healthcare, and rural employment are frequently expedited. These actions create a sense of direct responsibility between leaders and citizens by addressing pressing public needs and demonstrating how responsive governments are to popular demands.

Symbolic Representation:

Populist politicians frequently present themselves as defenders of underrepresented groups, such as women, lower castes, and the impoverished. Populists elevate voices that might

otherwise stay politically excluded by highlighting their support for these organizations. In addition to strengthening the political system's legitimacy in the eyes of these populations, this symbolic representation promotes a more inclusive and varied political dialogue.

Short-Termism in Policy:

A major criticism of populism is its tendency to prioritize immediate electoral gains over long-term policy sustainability. Populist measures, while politically popular, often lack careful consideration of fiscal constraints, institutional capacities, or long-term social impact. Policies designed to win votes—such as loan waivers, cash transfers, or highly subsidized schemes—may undermine economic stability if implemented without planning for sustainability.

Erosion of Institutions:

Populist politics frequently minimize the importance of institutions and bureaucratic systems in favor of the leader's charisma. Direct public appeals have the potential to circumvent legislative discussion, erode accountability, and weaken checks and balances. The legitimacy and independence of democratic institutions, such as the legislature, courts, and public service, could eventually be threatened by this personalization of politics.

Polarization:

Populist rhetoric frequently divides society into “people” versus “elite,” or exploits caste, religious, and regional identities to consolidate support. Such divisive strategies can deepen social and political polarization, increasing tension between different groups and eroding social cohesion. Polarization may also make consensus-building difficult, complicating governance and policymaking.

Economic Implications:

Populist policies that emphasize immediate relief over structural reforms can strain public finances. Frequent subsidies, loan waivers, and expansive welfare programs without adequate revenue planning may limit long-term investments in infrastructure, education, and growth-oriented initiatives. This creates a cycle of short-term relief at the cost of sustainable development.

Populism in Indian Politics: An Analysis

The rise of populism in Indian politics has changed the country's democracy. Because populism appeals to people's baser desires and impulses. A thorough analysis of the literature demonstrates the complexity of the phenomenon and the necessity of a nuanced explanation that considers the various historical, cultural, and regional settings of India. This is due to the fact that a comprehensive analysis of previous research reveals the diversity of the phenomenon. Given the size of India, a nuanced viewpoint is required. The various views of populism demonstrate its complex nature. This demonstrates that populism can take many different forms, hence a thorough theoretical framework is required. This argument is ongoing. Some academics believe populism, especially when led by authoritarian or charismatic leaders, can undermine democratic institutions and processes, weakening the democratic values that underpin a society. Authoritarian or charismatic populist leaders like Donald Trump have this attitude. This is especially true when populism is led by authoritarians. Recent political popularity of populism supports this idea. Language and castebased political parties have made Indian democracy more inclusive and responsive to underrepresented groups, according to one opinion. Language and caste-based political parties have increased the inclusiveness of Indian democracy, according to another opinion. The previous session illuminated populism's flexible and sometimes conflicting effect on India's political system. This emphasises the need for a

contextual understanding of the political phenomena, including its pros and downsides. This kind of inquiry is necessary since it emphasises its importance.

The prevalent belief that populist tactics are only beneficial in the short term raises concerns about their long-term economic viability. The persistent conflict between political expediency and economic prudence in Indian politics is unclear. This war is a dilemma since both aims contradict. These two aims are irreconcilable and cannot be attained simultaneously. To understand populism, one must consider India's vast geographical and cultural variety. This is because India has many ethnicities and religions. Populist movements may utilise different methods based on state and local obstacles and possibilities. This is because populism is widespread in many states and towns. To comprehend populism and its effects, apply a method that is tailored to the current situation. Variety adds complication to the inquiry. Populism's role in decreasing social and economic inequality is also extensively debated. Populist leaders may rally lower-caste and poorer populations, giving them a forum to express their political views. In order to address persistent injustices and socioeconomic inequities, Indian democracy is aiming to improve. Inclusion is frequently regarded a crucial aspect of this evolution.

Causes of Populism in Indian Politics

Populism in India arises from a complex interplay of socio-economic, cultural, and political factors that create fertile ground for leaders to appeal directly to "the people" against perceived elites.

Socio-Economic Inequalities: Widespread poverty, unemployment, agrarian distress, and regional disparities create dissatisfaction with conventional governance. Populist leaders exploit these grievances by promising immediate relief, welfare schemes, and subsidies, presenting themselves as responsive to the needs of ordinary citizens.

Cultural and Identity-Based Factors: India's diverse social fabric, structured around caste, religion, and regional identities, provides opportunities for populist mobilization. Leaders often frame politics as a moral struggle, positioning themselves as protectors of marginalized communities or regional interests against a disconnected elite.

Charismatic Leadership: Strong, charismatic personalities play a pivotal role in populist politics. By cultivating a personal connection with voters and projecting themselves as the voice of the people, such leaders amplify populist appeals beyond party structures.

Media and Technological Influence: The proliferation of traditional and digital media platforms enables politicians to communicate directly with the electorate. Social media campaigns, mass rallies, and targeted messaging facilitate the rapid dissemination of populist narratives, reinforcing emotional engagement.

Political Competition: Multi-party competition incentivizes short-term populist strategies to secure votes, often prioritizing popularity over long-term policy.

Conclusion

Populism in Indian politics reflects the interplay of historical legacies, socio-economic grievances, cultural identities, and leadership dynamics. While it has democratized political participation and brought attention to marginalized groups, it also poses challenges to governance, institutional stability, and long-term policy sustainability. Understanding the trends, causes, and consequences of populism is essential for scholars, policymakers, and citizens seeking to navigate the complexities of contemporary Indian democracy. Populism, in India, is both a tool of mobilization and a test of institutional resilience. Indian populism is a complex and dynamic force that has a big impact on how the nation's democracy operates.

Although it is evident that linguistic and caste-based political parties assist marginalized communities, it is crucial to recognize that the emergence of populism, especially when it is headed by charismatic individuals, could endanger democratic institutions. This debate underscores the need of adopting a nuanced and contextually grounded understanding of India's complex political landscape. Populist arguments are mostly centred on economic and financial matters. The implementation of populist measures poses a significant risk to fiscal discipline and the long-term sustainability of the economy. The Indian political landscape exhibits a delicate equilibrium between economic measures and political gains. The geographical and cultural variety of India presents challenges to the implementation of populism, since it leads to variations in strategies and outcomes at the state and municipal levels. Populist movements exhibit variations in response to the socio-political context, thereby emphasising the need of localised analysis. The phenomenon of populism in India is characterised by its intricate and ever-evolving nature. There are divergent viewpoints about the delineation, ramifications, and resultant consequences.

References:

1. Allcock, J. B. "Populism': A Brief Biography." *Sociology*, vol. 5, no. 3, 1971, pp. 371–87. JSTOR, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42851097>. Accessed 12 Oct. 2023.
2. Bijukumar, V. "Economic Reforms, Populism and Party Politics In India." *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, vol. 65, no. 2, 2004, pp. 161–80. JSTOR, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41855807>. Accessed 12 Oct. 2023.
3. Jayasuriya, Kanishka. "The Rise of The Right: Populism and Authoritarianism in Southeast Asian Politics." *Southeast Asian Affairs*, 2020, pp. 43–56. JSTOR, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26938883>. Accessed 12 Oct. 2023.
4. Populism and Patronage." *Economic and Political Weekly*, vol. 44, no. 37, 2009, pp. 5–6. JSTOR, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25663528>. Accessed 12 Oct. 2023.
5. Subramanian, Narendra. "Populism in India." *The SAIS Review of International Affairs*, vol. 27, no. 1, 2007, pp. 81–91. JSTOR, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26999347>. Accessed 12 Oct. 2023.
6. Rao, B.N. (2021). *The Third Eye of Governance: Rise of Populism, Decline in Social Research*. New Delhi: Speaking Tiger.
7. Varshney, A. (1994). *Democracy, Development and Countryside: Urban-rural Struggles in India*. Cambridge University Press.
8. Yadav, Y (2000). *Understanding Second Democratic. Upsurge In* Francine Franke, Zoya Hasan et al (Eds). *Transforming India: Social and Political Dynamics in Democracy*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.