IOSR Journal of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)
Volume 21, Issue 10, Ver. 9 (October.2016) PP 13-19
e-ISSN: 2279-0837, p-ISSN: 2279-0845.
www.iosrjournals.org

Political Party–Interest Group Relationship A Study In Uttar Kannada District Karnataka State

Associate Prof. Subhash B Naik, ScienceBGVS's Sadashivgad
Department of Political

Abstract:-One of the paradoxes of political science around the world, particularly in liberal democracies, is that broad agreement exists on the important of the relationship between political parties and interest groups but little research has been conducted on that relationship. By drawing on the experiences of district sold established democracies, new ones, and some in transition to democracy this article provides the first general analysis of the part- group relationship in liberal democracies. Some research have been conducted on specific aspects of party group relations within particular democracies But virtually no studies explain the various element and assess the significance of the party group connection within individual liberal democracies and no comparative study on exists of the relationship across district this article seeks to provide a holistic understanding of the party group relationship within individual democracies.Within this general, holistic objective, four specific goals can be summarized: (1) Some interest groups have relations with political parties while others do not, and for those that do, (2) Various forms do party group relations take in democracies, and can these be developed into a model that includes , among other relationships, the close ties of socialist parties with labor groups, the lack of connection of most groups with parties, and situations where groups and parties conflict (3)The partygroup relationship or lack of it, affect the political system, particularly policy making and representation (4) General patterns exist across district that explain the party group relationship and its consequences in liberal democracies.

Key word: *Political parties, Interest groups and Democracies*

I. INTRODUCTION:

A political party is a group of voters organized to support certain public policies. The aim of a political party is to elect officials who will try to carry out the party's policies. A political party offers candidates for public office. It sets out positions on issues that may range from war and taxes to how children should be educated. When people in a democracy disagree about what the government should do, voters express their opinions by voting for the candidates that most closely reflect their views. Political parties provide a way for voters to easily identify a candidate's positions. Political parties may be large or small, national or local. Large political parties generally have millions of members and supporters. In democratic election campaigns, parties compete freely for votes. Such competition is one of the hallmarks of democracy.In virtually countries likeIndia, especially liberal democracies, political parties and interestgroups
are among the most important institutions that define the character of the political system and serve as the principal links between citizens and their government. Few political scientists would disagree with this assessment, even though in recent years increasing scholarly attention has been paid to the role of social movements as an important form of citizen government linkage. Several scholars have identified the dynamics of the political party interest group relationship as central in shaping the structure and nature of democratic government . Despite this assertion, for the most part the literature has treated parties and groups separately and, where it examines the connection between them, has focused mainly on party group competition. In this article we take a broader look at the inter relationship of parties and groups (in some cases party-group social movement relations) to more accurately assess the significance of the connection to democratic government.
Such distinctions, virtually unmentioned in the existing literature, were a major impetus forth is study. There is much we do not understand about this apparently fundamental relationship the forms it can take, its consequences for politics and policy making, and its effect in enhancing or undermining the democratic process. By drawing on the experiences of this district sold, established democracies, new ones, and some in transition to democracy this book elaborates on the variations noted here and provides the first comprehensive analysis of the party group relationship between major parties and major interests in liberal democracies. As a starting point for the study, this introductory article reviews existing

knowledge on the party group connection in liberal democracies, explains the methodology of the study and how the research seeks to achieve coherence and consistency in the article
Uttara Kannada District is one of the biggest districts of our State with abundant natural resources. The district has varied geographical features with thick forest, perennial rivers and abundant flora and fauna and a long coastal line of about 140 KM in length. It is surrounded by Belgaum District and State of Goa in the North, by Dharwar District in the East, by Shimoga and Udupi Districts in the South. Arabian Sea forms the West border. In its 10.25 lakh hectares of total land, of which 8.28 hectares is Forest land. And only about 1.2 lakh hectares of land (roughly about 10%) is under agriculture / horticulture. The District consists of 11 Talukas viz. Karwar, Ankola, Kumta, Honnavar, Bhatkal, Sirsi, Siddapur, Yellapur, Mundgod, Haliyal, Supa(Joida). covered to facilitate provides guidelines for approaching the analysis in the district.

II. MEANING

The term 'political party' isn't something where senators, representatives, and other political officials have fun all day. Instead, a political party is a group of dedicated people who come together to win elections, operate the government, and determine public policy. So, you can see that this is anything but the fun type of 'party' that we usually think of when we hear the word.Political parties also actively try to gather volunteers to help register voters as well as organize and run the election day voting. The hope is that the more people that are involved in helping with the election, the more interest there will be in the outcome, which should increase voter turnout. The ultimate goal is to get the person the party supports to win an election.While political parties do end up endorsing or supporting individual candidates, they do so because those people share very similar ideals and political positions of the entire party. Thus, another function of political parties is to present alternative policies to the electorate, called their political platform. A political platform is the ideals and positions a political party has. Thus, we often learn of the ideals a political party has from the members that support it.When a member of a political party wins an elected position, they in essence take responsibility of running the government. This includes staffing positions with loyal party supporters and developing connections among other elected officials to gain support for policies and their implementation. For example, our current president, Barack Obama, who is a member of the Democratic Party, did this when he named his White House staff, Cabinet members, and other appointed officials.The last function that a political party has is to put forth its own policies and oppose the winning party, when appropriate, if the party did not win an elected position. The purpose of this is to promote healthy debate so that the winning party remains fair in the policies that they promote. For example, if you were to apply for a promotion at a job and a co-worker ended up getting it over you, you would still hope that you would be listened to and valued in your current role even though you aren't the person in power.

Political parties perform key tasks in a democratic society, such as

1.Soliciting and articulating public policy priorities and civic needs and problems as identified by members and supporters.
2.socialising and educating voters and citizens in the functioning of the political and electoral system and the generation of general political values.
3.balancing opposing demands and converting them into general policies.
4.Activating and mobilising citizens into participating in political decisions and transforming their opinions into viable policy options.
5.Channeling public opinion from citizens to government.
6.Recruiting and training candidates for public office

Political parties are often described as institutionalized mediators between civil society and those who decide and implement decisions. As such, they enable their members' and supporters' demands to be addressed in parliament and in government. Even though parties fulfill many vital roles and perform several functions in a democratic society, the nomination and presentation of candidates in the electoral campaign is the most visible function to the electorate.
To perform the above mentioned tasks and functions, political parties and citizens need some rights and obligations guaranteed or ruled by constitution or law. These include

- Freedom of organisation
- Freedom to stand for election
- Freedom of speech and assembly
- Provision of a fair and peaceful competition among parties and candidates
- Mechanisms to ensure plurality
- Inclusion in the electoral process and contacts with electoral bodies
- A level playing field and freedom from discrimination
- Media access and fair reporting guarantees

- Transparent and accountable political finance

The internal functioning of individual political parties is to some extent determined by forces that are external to political parties, such as the electoral system, political culture, and legal regulations. However, internal processes of political parties, such as the personality of leaders and staff, the ideological foundations, party history, and internal political culture are considered to be even more influential on the internal functioning. If a political party would like the democratic principles of electoral politics to be applied within the party, they may consider practices like internal information and consultation processes, internal (formal or informal) rules and structures for the organisation and decision-making within the party, and transparency in the party's functioning at all levels. Party members may also take on more formal roles in decision-making like participating in internal elections for leadership positions or in selecting the party's candidate(s) in the upcoming elections. Many parties also work actively to enhance the role of traditionally under-represented groups in their parties.

III. DEFINITION

A political party is defined as an organised group of people with at least roughly similar political aims and opinions, that seeks to influence public policy by getting its candidates elected to public office.

Parties tend to be deeply and durably entrenched in specific substructures of society in a sustainable and well functioning democracy. They can link the governmental institutions to the elements of the civil society in a free and fair society and are regarded as necessary for the functioning any modern democratic political system.

Political parties as we know them did not begin to develop until the late 1600s. The ancient Greeks, who were pioneers in developing democracy, had no organized political parties in the modern sense. The senate of the ancient Romans had two groups that represented people with different interests — the Patricians and the Plebeians. The Patricians represented noble families. The Plebeians represented the wealthy merchants and the middle class. Although these two groups often mingled, at times they voted as factions, or parties, on particular issues that were important to the groups they represented.

For many centuries after the fall of Rome (A.D. 476), the people of Europe had little voice in politics. Thus there were no true political parties — only factions that supported one noble family or another. Political parties developed as representative assemblies gained power. In England, this change began after what was called the Popish Plot of 1678.

In 1678, a rumor spread through England that Roman Catholics were plotting to kill King Charles II and give the throne to Charles' brother, James, Duke of York (who was a Roman Catholic). There was no real Popish plot, but an alarmed Parliament barred all Roman Catholics from public office and tried to take away the Duke of York's right to inherit the throne. But to King Charles II, Parliament seemed to be challenging royal authority, and he struck back by dissolving Parliament.

All over England people were either for or against the king's act. Those who urged the king to call a new Parliament were called Petitioners. Those who backed the king's deed were called Abhorrers because they abhorred any attempt to control the king's actions. Before long the two factions took on other names. Petitioners were called Whigs. "Whig" was an old term for Scottish Presbyterians who opposed the government. The king's supporters were called Tories. "Tory" was originally a name given to Irish Roman Catholics who had suffered under Protestant rule. These old names took on new meanings.

The basic difference between Whigs and Tories in the 1600s was their view of what government should do and how strong it should be. Tories wanted rule by a strong king. Whigs wanted ordinary people to have more rights and gain more control of their government. In time, as Parliament took greater control, the Whigs and Tories developed into organized parties.

The leaders of the American Revolution did not like the idea of parties and political battles between parties. Upon his retirement from public life in 1796, George Washington warned Americans against "faction" (parties). James Madison thought parties were probably necessary, although he did not entirely approve of them. Alexander Hamilton thought that faction was a vice to be guarded against at all times. Thomas Jefferson declared in 1789, "If I could not go to heaven but with a party, I would not go there at all." Nevertheless, the men who held these views founded the first two great American political parties.

Although there are a host of references in scholarly journals on the party group relationship, there is a lack of systematic researchand theory on the fundamentals of their interrelationship. Thus, the importanceof the party group connection has long been taken for granted, falling largely into the realm of intuitive axioms. Some of these may not be true, however, or elements of them may vary from system tosystem.

IV. THIS ARTICLE FOCUS AND GOALS OF THE PARTY- GROUP

When parties and interests interact, they can do so in several ways within the political system.Interaction could simply occur on an informal level, such as when a group or its members helpan individual partycandidate during an election. Group representatives could approach party leaders in the parliament or executive to lobby them on an issue. Or the party in power could try to bring several groups together on an ad hoc basis to deal with an issue such as developing an incomes policy. However, the main focus of this article is on a longer term aspect of the party group relationship: the extent to which major political parties and major interests have related in the past and continue to relate or interact the organizational level.That is, to what extent have parties and groups had formal organizational ties, cooperated in elections, or worked in concert on developing and even implementing policies, among other things? Or has the pattern of party group organizational relations been conflict ridden, or simply one of separation? Or has it alternated between or among some or all of these forms of interaction? If, however, the group or interest has no institutional relationship with a party orparties, we are interested in finding out what other relationships, long or short term, it has with parties. We want to identify any contact parties and groups might have, including the informal ones listed earlier.

General study focus of analysis of the party-group

A general explanation of past, present and likely future party group relationships will be helpful to study of politics trying to understand trends in democracies in general, as well as the politics of individual.

Table 1:Demographic details

S. No	Particulars	Value
1	Population	
	Male	686876
	Female	666768
	Total population	1353644
2	Area	
	Rural	975254
	Urban	378390
	Total population	1353644
3	Literates	
	Male	79.2%
	Female	71.2%
	Total percentage	75.0%
4	Education facilities	
	Pre-primary	1310
	Primary	2346
	Middle	314

(Sources: Annual report district profile Uttar Kannada)

Note: Table 1 most of the population is male compare to female and they belong most number of people is rural area and also literates is total percentage is 75 out of male is 75% and female is 71%.

Specific goals can be summarized:

(1) Some interest groups have relations with political parties while others do not, and for those that do.
(2) Various forms of the party group relations take in democracies, and can these be developed into a model that includes, among other relationships, the close ties of socialist parties with labor groups, the lack of connection of most groups with parties, and situations where groups and parties conflict.
(3) The party-group relationship, or lack of it, affects the political system, particularly policy making and representation.
(4) General patterns exist across district that explains the party group relationship and its consequence in liberal democracies.

Table 2:
Interested Party-Group

Sl.No.	Particulars	Respondents	Percentages
1	Interested party groups	261	52.20
2	No Interested party groups	239	47.8

Total	**500**	**100**

(**Sources: Annual Survey**)

Note: Table 2 out of total population of Uttar Kannada district we selected 500 candidate. In this survey we find some are interested for political party and some are not interested in political party.

In addition, although it is not a specific goal of this article to directly address the contemporary debate about party-group competition and the decline of major parties and the consequent rise of interest groups, social movements, and third parties, the book throws light on these subjects. Besides being important elements of the party-group relationship, as we will see later, this party decline–interest group rise and the broader element of party-group competition form the bulk of the existing literature on the party-group connection.

To be sure, this article does not fill all the gaps in our understanding. As with many article, this one may raise more questions than it answers. It does, however, move our understanding of this important relationship between parties and groups to a higher level. In so doing it provides a base line of information and offers directions for further research on thesubject for both comparative politics and the politic s of individual countries.

1. The Political Party–Interest Group Definitional Debate

The debate over the distinction between a party and an interest group has recently intensified. Although scholars have seen parties and groups as performing both distinct and over lapping functions, what were long considered the major distinctions between the two organizations(for example,Schatt schneider 1960; Key1964; Duverger 1972, 1–2; Rose 1985) no longer seem to hold, if indeed they ever did. The three most important distinctions were that (1) the major goal of a political party is to win formal control of government to implement its program, whereas an interest group does not wish to win formal control of government but simply desires to influence public policy in its areas of concern; (2) parties have an avowedly public purpose as broad coalitions that facilitate compromise and governance in a society as awhole, whereas interest groups are narrow concerns that focus and aggregate their members'interests and articulate them to government; and (3) parties run candidates in elections, where as interest groups do not (see, for example, Almond and Powell 1966; Rose 1985; Walker1991). Several schola rs (for example, Yishai 1995; Burstein 1998) have argued that these andother distinctions often do not exist in pr actice. This is often true not only in multipartysystems, they assert, where certain political organizations take on the guise of both party andinterest group, but also in some two-party systems where the conventional wisdom—that parties and groups are clearly differentiated—does not hold. For instance, in Israel's multi party system the religious parties, with their narrowly focused plat forms, undermine allthree of these "fundamental" distinctions between parties and groups. This is also true of newly formed organizations in two-party systems like the Country side Alliance in Britain, which promotes rural values.Finally, we need to address the problem of designating an interest group. So far the terms *interest group* and *interest* have been used inter changeably, a consequence of the terminology problem in interest group studies. Its cause is two fold. First, within a particular sector, suchas business, there are several individual interest groups peak associations, trade associations, individual firms, and so on. The term commonly used to designate this broader political concern is the generic term *interest* and some times the equally generic term *lobby* thebusiness interest, the business lobby, the agricultural interest, the agricultural lobby, and soon. Second, a formal interest group, particularly broad based organizations like business and labor peak associations, some times act and are perceived as representatives not only of their official membership but of the broad sectoral interests with which they are identified. This is particularly true in neocorporatist negotiations where business and labor are seen as representing their entire sector, including nonmembers of their organizations, but it is alsotrue at a lesser level.

2. A Working Definition of Social Movement

Like interest groups, social movements display a wide range of diversity depending on their degree of organizational and strategic cohesiveness and the extent of their antiestablishmentstatus. At one end of the sca le are organizations like the Country side Alliance in Britain, a federation of establishment-type groups promoting rural values that are well financed and have well-or chest rated activities (Maloney and Jordan 1998). At the other end are loose-knit organizations with poorly coordinated strategies that are decidedly anti establishment in their"membership" and leadership, like the peasant movement in Chiapas, Mexico. Falling in the middle are organizations like the Civil Rights movement in the United States in the 1960s,with a defined leadership, a loose organizational structure, and a mixed record of coordinated strategy. Furthermore, with the broad definition of interest groups and interests used in thisbook, itcould be argu

ed, along the lines of Burstein (1998), that social movements are simply a loose-knit form of interest group. Certainly, there is overlap at the margin. For instance, whether the Country side Alliance is an interest group or a social movement is a moot point.The interest group–social movement distinction is compounded by the fact that many social movements develop into traditional, often establishment interest groups, as has the environmental movement across the Western world since the 1960s. Sometimessocialmovements even make the transition into parties, as with the Greens, Populists, and Progressives at the turn of the twentieth century in the United States and Solidarity in Poland.
Despite this overlap, for analytical purposes some widely accepted attributes of social movements can be identified that distinguish them from traditional interest groups, the distinction we adopt in this article. Combining and paraphrasing the work of McCarthy and Zald (1977), Tilly (1984), Eyeman and Jamison (1991), and Ost ,social movements manifest all or most of six elements. They (1) represent people outsideestablished political institutions or who feel a low level of political efficacy in affecting thoseinsti tutions; (2) seek to change elements of the socioeconomic and political structure, make visible public demands for changes in the distribution or exercise of power in society, or both;(3) employ collective political action that uses, in whole or in large part, noninstitutionalchannels such as protests, sit-ins, passive resistance, and sometimes illegal means such asviolence; (4) hold a strong antipolitics stance, partic ularly in their formative period, manifesting as an anti establishment,

Political Science Perspectives on Party Group Relations

In terms of the ways the party group relationship has been viewed by political science over they ears, we can identify five perspectives, the first three of which draw on an analysis by Yishai(1995).

First, for most pluralists, groups and parties are distinct, performing separate functions in the political process. This is particularly true for a two-party system, which" makes for a sharper functional differentiation between parties and interest groups" (Epstein1967, 278), but is valid for multiparty systems as well. Thus, most pluralists havetreatedparties and groups separately andbeen little concerned with the connection between them.

Second, neocorporatists have largely ignored the question of groupparty relations becausetheir focus is mai nly on the tripartite relations of government, business, and labor. Therefore,implicitly atleast, in this perspective party is used synonymously with *governing* party andnot with parties in general. Consequent ly, a good argument can be made that this focus has caused neocorporatists to underestimate the role of parties in the political process,including the lead-up to tripartite negotiations and agreements. In fact, important accounts ofcorporatism have totally ignored parties as political actors (for example, Cawson 1 986; Williamson 1989).

A third general approach to the groupparty relationship is that in which political parties' playa decisive role in the political process, which Yishai refers to as the partisan model. Here, interest groups are not distinct from political parties (pluralism), nor are they oblivious to them (corporatism). Rather, interest groups branch from political parties, are sub servient to them, or both. La Palombara (1964) described the Italian scene in terms of partisan predominance.

The fourth and fifth perspectives on party group relations have come largely from scholars of American politics, although they imply that their perspectives have application beyond theUnited States. The fourth is a product of the so-called responsible party model, which argues that the "sovereign majority" can rule only through strong political parties that meet the basic criteria of responsible government. In the absence of strong parties, interest groups undermine majority rule, developing close ties to politicians and party factions in ways thatallow them to prevail over the will of the majority. The str ongest advocates of this view were Schatts chneider (1942) and a report by the American Political Science Association's (APSA) Committee on Political Parties (APSA 1950). To some extent the work of Lowi (1979) andOlson (1982) reflects this view, although their emphasis was on theincreasing power andeffects of in terest groups and less on the importance of parties. Olson explained manypost–World War II problems in Western Europe in terms of sclerosis causedby interestgroups.Ironically, Olson demonstrated that interest group s are often strong even in strongparty systems, which tended to undermine the argument of the responsible party modeladvocates. These advocates were extensively criticized (for example, Kirkpatrick 1971), and later research— mainly on the U. S. system—
y rational choice scholars (for example, Rohde1991; Aldrich and Rohde 1997–1998) shows that strong legislative coordination can bedeveloped among parties to dominate political agendas and constraininterest grou ps.

REFERENCE

[1] Barkan, Joel D (2001) " Elections in Developing Countries," in Richard Rose ed., International Encyclopedia of Elections, Washington D.C.:CQ Press.

[2] Binder, Loenard (1978) in a Moment of Enthusiasm: Political Power and the second stratum in Egypt, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

[3] Dahl, Robert A. (1971) Polyarchy: Participation and opposition, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

[4] Diamond, Larry (1999) Developing Democracy: Towards Consolidated, Baltimore: Johns Hokins University Press.

[5] Dix, Robert H . (1989) "Cleavage Structures and Party System in Latin America," Comparative Politics 22, (1), Pp. 23-37.

[6] Kitschelt, Herbert (1995)" Formation of Party Cleavages in Post- Communist Democracies: Theoretical Propositions," Party Politics, 1(4), Pp. 447-472.

[7] Lust- Okar, Ellen (2004)" The Management and Manipulation of Political Opposition,"Comparative Politics, 36(2), Pp 159-179.

[8] Huntington, Samuel p (1999) the third wave: democratization in the late twentieth century, Norman, ok: university of Oklahoma press.

[9] Sartori, Giovanni (1976) Parties and Party System: A Framework for Analysis Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[10] Mainwaring Scott P. (1999) Rethinking Party System In The Third Wave Of Democratization: The Case Of Brazil, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.