

A Brief Introduction to The Politics of Industrial Development of India since Independence

* *Snehal Kalyanrao Laghane*

Introduction

There are few states today that do not aim for modernity. The days of leaders who did not care about the archaism of the society they administered are almost over. The leaders of almost every state, both in the old institutional state and in the new states of Asia and Africa, feel a persistent need for policies that will bring them into the fold of modernity. They encounter much of the disagreement among their politically interested compatriots that they are not quite modern. Many traditionalists reserve the right to assert that it is only by cutting the essence of the oldest tradition that a sincere and stable modernity can be achieved". Fully meets the trend of industrial development in India. Development can be understood as a process, condition, activity or event. So far, progress has followed a long history of speeches. In the development process, politics plays a fundamental role; it can be argued that politics is an intrinsic feature of development discourse. On the eve of independence, India's economic situation was worse than ever. Development growth was marginalized and the country struggled to lift itself out of poverty and hunger Per capita income was low; most people were not even able to support themselves. Sources of income were few and the maximum percentage of the population depended on agriculture and its sub-sectors. Being primarily a country dominated by agriculture, it was impossible for the government to transform it overnight and consider all possible dimensions of development. The development and growth of nature are based on three main sectors, Primary sector (agriculture), a secondary sector (industrial) and tertiary sector (service). They are mainly agricultural, and although there are exceptions, such as in West Africa and Malaysia, their development procedures tend to be very traditional. At the same time, the elites of the new states, almost without exception, are engaged in economic development. "Means sovereign, democratic and egalitarian, interested in the people, economically developed and scientific. It is about discovering more abundant and better resources, increasing the efficiency of resource processing, accumulating capital through savings, heavy taxation, taxes on capital and foreign investment. , loans and gifts. Their motivations were many, many want to raise the standard of living of their people, and they also believe that a modern country to be worth anything in the eyes of humanity must be industrialized, rationalized and "economically advanced"

Politics of Industrial Development

Phase 1: Politics of industrial foundation development.

Advocates of modernity argue that no country can claim to be modern without being economically advanced or progressive. The center of dynamism is economically advanced suggests to have an economy based on advanced technologies, to be industrialized and to have a high standard of living". Phase, planning was the tedious work of solar nationalists in parliament. They face a huge gap and disagreement among politicians while discussing what type of policy to adopt and what to reject to meet the country's needs for social and economic growth and development. It was therefore the race between ideologies where on the one hand Jawaharlal Nehru proclaimed to make India a self-sufficient nation by giving it the technical bases, on the other hand, the nationalists influenced by Gandhi a philosophy tried to build India. Based on the Gandhi a vision of building self-sufficiency by promoting agricultural practices to support the the social economy in the villages. These two opposing ideologies created some obstacles in the nation-building process. Knowing the geography and history of the world, Jawaharlal Nehru understands that without industrialization, it is difficult to transform India from an underdeveloped nation to a developed nation. He had planned to invest a huge amount of money in the industrial sector. The importance given to industries is understood by the fact that in 1948 we had a first industrial policy. In the meantime, the first five-year plan (FYP) has been completed and the socialist model has been accepted as the main axis of the country's social and economic policy in 1956, a second industrial resolution replaced the political resolution of 1948. In the same period, in 1954 a program based on Gandhi and philosophy was started in the name of the Community Development Program. These are the years of the founding of India's industrial and social sector. Before 1947, only two industries developed during the colonial period, namely jute and cotton, which were specific to the chosen region. After independence in 1956, the government laid the foundation for a steel plant in India. Decisions made during this period can be analyzed by examining the government's five-year plans. The main motive for the close-ups was to make India a self-sufficient and self-sufficient country. The government has taken strict measures for the development of the nation. Priority has therefore been given to public-private partnership. In the first five-year plan, agriculture was the main reason for planning commission, but the second plan was designed entirely to promote the industrialization of the country. The government contracted large foreign loans to encourage exports and establish several industries. Of the industrial establishment and designed an industrial policy.

Phase 2: Politics of industrial development before neoliberal era.

Historic investment deals haven't exactly followed optimal patterns. They have been influenced by the inadequacy of the private investment process, by specific government policies and by the course of wars. Modify the conditions of supply. They destroyed capital and, rarely, improved the development of new technologies relevant to the peacetime economy and changed the political and social framework in pathways for growth in peacetime. The historical sequence of trade advances and trending period's results from these deviations from actual models from optimal models and these instabilities, along with the impact of wars, produce historical growth trajectories that diverge from those that are optimal, understood before the event, he would have yielded. However, the economic history of emerging societies takes some of its rough form of the efforts of societies to move closer to optimal sectoral trajectories. Having seen the degradation of industrial growth due to externalities such as the aggression of the war with China and Pakistan in 1961 and 1966. The government was able to perceive the direct impact of the war on the national economy. The negative effect is also visible in the third five-year plan (FYP), when the government took no initiative in industrial development. Not only that, when power in the center changes guard and Janta Dal came to power, the newly elected government did not even invent the FYP in 1966. From 1966 to 1969 (planning vacations), the government developed an annual plan that was the innovation of the Janta Dal government. They criticized the Congressional government for their FYP strategies and pushed for industrial installation. Therefore, in these three years, the government began to focus on agriculture rather than industry; agriculture has once again become the focus of government strategy and capacity building. There seemed to be a great bitter struggle between the parties for power rather than development, especially industrial development. Therefore, suggested by post-development theorist John Replay, "human improvement is not the real goal of development; human control and domination are. It is true that attracting more and more people to the formal sector is essential for the consolidation of its authority by the national state on its territory". Many authors argue that industrialization is a new form of hegemony after the World War. This was the time when Western countries began to persuade other nations for healthy development. Indeed, post-development theorists Explained, the objective of development is closely linked to modernization, which for them consists in extending control of the Western world and its nationalist allies to developing countries.

Phase 3: Politics of industrial development in the neoliberal era.

This phase is considered to be India's liberalization period. The policy was to liberalize licenses and procedures to encourage foreign investment and foreign technology deals. Public sector enterprises and Monopoly and Restricted Trade (MRTP) practices were introduced. Although prior to this period the government was involved in growth and manufacturing activities in the industry, there have been many challenges that have limited industrial growth, such as inadequate infrastructure, restrictive labor laws, slow adoption of technology, low spending on R&D and innovations, business processes and complex and time-consuming authorizations.

Phase 4: Politics of industrial development in neoliberal crisis

Some development thinkers had predicted that the neoliberal type of ideas had inherent drawbacks. They argued that neoliberals and development seem to claim the same ideals. Although neoliberal industrial policy has at the same time brought some positive changes to the existing economic structure, it has its drawbacks. The impact of neoliberal policy could be analyzed after a while. The concentration of economic power, increase in unemployment, no change in productivity, ignorance of social objectives, distortion of the structure of production, i.e. a decline in the growth of capital goods industries, negative effect on small industries, the danger of business colonization and a sharp increase in regional imbalances. Since India was not the only country that followed neoliberals, it was rather a global phenomenon the impact of policies based on neoliberals was very global and led to the neoliberal crisis. The economic depression of 2008 is a testament to the fact that neoliberals have to evolve systematically from time to time. Some development thinkers have argued that there is no difference between neoliberals and development. They have raised some questions about the current ideology and also debate on alternative development. Hence the evolution of alternative development which speaks of an alternative to development and post-development without criticizing them. Therefore, alternative development is nothing more than a development critique which has supported holistic development by including all kinds of ideological development after purification.

Conclusion

Conclusion It can be safely said that the first phase of the reforms aimed to strengthen the institutions of macroeconomic stabilization and structural adjustment. The second phase was aimed at liberalization and privatization. The development of the Indian economy after independence is appreciable; the transformation since 1980 has surprised most observers.

Economists around the world hope that the Indian economy will become the third largest economy in the world by the mid-2030s. India already ranks third in terms of gross domestic product (GDP) estimated on the basis of parity. Purchase of electricity (PPA). Neoliberal reforms have liberalized the Indian economy and foreign investment in most sectors is allowed up to 100% on the automatic track; only certain sectors require government approval. Recent research points out that after 2003⁰⁴ India experienced a high rate of economic growth due to political efforts of the legacies of the past. It also confirms that the economic reforms did not happen instantly in 1991, but were predicted by the pro-business agenda reviewed by sitting prime ministers in the 1980s. In this case, the real turning point in the decade. India's economic growth was 1980⁸¹, not the early 1990s. From the point of view of things; all the major political parties in India support the economic reform program. Even considering that the 1991 reform was driven by global economic obligations, it was the political process that made it possible. One gets the impression that India's reform agenda is driven by a philosophy of success rather than a politics of anxiety or coercion.

References

1. Shill, Edward. Political development in the new state. Comparative studies in Society and History. 1960; 2(03):265-292.
2. Chatterjee, Partha. Development planning and the Indian state. New Delhi: Oxford university press, 1997.
3. Shill, Edward. Political development in the new state. Comparative studies in Society and History. 1960;2(03):265-292.
4. Rostow WW, The stages of economic growth. Economy history review. 1959; 12(1):1-16.
5. Replay, John. Development studies and post-development critique. Progress in Development Studies. 2004;4(4):350-354.
6. Carter, Neil. The Politics of Environment: Ideas, Activism, Policy. Cambridge: Cambridge university press, 2007.
7. The politics of industrial development in India since independence by Ajay Kumar Gautam, Neha Yadav