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1. Abstract

The objective of this paper is to study the impact of the split of JDU-BJP in the Indian state of Bihar and its impact on effective governance. The study is a serious attempt to explore and find real impact of the split of the government on socio-political, economical and cultural level.

This study is in-depth analysis of the key indicators as a parameter of the effective governance in the state. This includes health, financial, infrastructure, development and efficiency of public welfare programs. The study explores the impact of split on these parameters.

The data used in the study is secondary data available at various sources. These include web journals, news websites, books, research papers, government reports and articles.

The analysis of data empirically suggests that there is a significant downfall of effective governance in almost all the parameters included in the study. The study invokes the truth that the government has shifted its energy from governance and the state suffered a lull.
2. Introduction

Absence of an effective leadership for the inclusive development of society, often yields such policy paralysis that potentially disrupt the socio-economic and political structure of any society. Bihar is no exception to this.

For the last two decades, Bihar has been a part of ‘Bimaru’ (PTI 2015) state and the era of Shri Lalu Prasad Yadav is popularly called ‘Jungle Raj’ (ANI news 2015). The state during his tenure occupied bottom rankings in many parameters of governance and development. (Raghvan 2005). Crime was rampant, medical facilities were ineffective and economy was in shambles. It was a classic example of how policy paralysis can impact every strata of a society.

In 2005, things changed. The citizen of Bihar voted RJD out. Shri Lalu Prasad Yadav was out of government after 15 years and a coalition of BJP-JDU was elected making Shri Nitish Kumar of JDU as the Chief Minister. The government which rode on promises and hope began delivering (Sinha 2011).

The impact was tremendous and people saw change in lives. Crime rate went down, civic facilities and business improved. Within a few years, Bihar was the fastest growing state in the country (PTI 2012). Bihar soon became a hub of economic activities and improved in various parameters. This led to the second win of party in 2010 elections, with even higher margin. (Times News Network 2010)

In June 2013, BJP-JDU parted ways. The clash of interest between CM of Bihar Nitish Kumar with the BJP’s Party leadership led to the split. Kumar was unhappy of promotion of Narendra Modi, then CM of Gujrat as the PM candidate for NDA. (WILLIAMS 2013)

3. Problem Statement and significance of study

The essential problem that is being studied here is the impact of the split of the two parties on governance. There has been no substantial study to impact of the split of the two parties.

This study is conducted before the general elections in the poll bound state of Bihar. The will help in understanding how the split has resulted change in the performance of government.

This study will certainly help in framing the policies for future government to foster public welfare and promote faster growth.
4. Research Question

The specific question addressed in this paper is

- What is the impact of JDU-BJP split on governance?

5. Research Hypothesis

The governance has suffered after the split of JDU and BJP.

6. Parameters Identified

- Development figures
- Agriculture GDP
- Industrial GDP
- Service sector GDP
- Percentage of people below poverty line
- Per Capita income
- HDI (cumulative of Health, education and income index)
- Road Construction - Growth figures
- Figures in public health - disease, death, infant mortality rate, Maternal mortality rate
- Gini’s coefficient
- Investment in the state
- Fresh proposal of investment in the state
- Crime figures - kidnapping, robbery, theft, rape, burglary
- Communal riots/ other riots
- Health care facilities
- Infant mortality rate
- Number of specialist doctors
7. Secondary Data

A. Gross state domestic Product (GSDP)

![GDP Graph]

*BSource: CSO Bihar*

Bihar’s economy grew at the rate of 15.05 per cent in 2012-13. This was the time when the alliance between the two parties was strong. After the split of BJP-JD(U) alliance in June 2013, growth rate fell drastically to 8.82 per cent in 2013-14. (Thakur 2014). ‘Bihar in 2010 was the fastest growing State in India with a 14.15 per cent GSDP (gross state domestic product). Bihar’s growth is now slower at about 9 per cent.’ (Patil 2015). During 2011-12, the economy of the state grew by 13.1% and was placed as the fastest growing state in Bihar.

B. Agriculture GDP

![Agriculture GDP Graph]

### C. Investment Proposal

**FALLING OFF THE INVESTOR’S RADAR**
The decline in investments and rising crimes don't paint a good picture for the state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FALLING INVESTMENT PROPOSAL (₹ cr)</th>
<th>RISING CRIME GRAPH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,920</td>
<td>1,47,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>657</td>
<td>1,60,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15*</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>1,84,961</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Till July; **Till June

Source: Industry department, Bihar Police

**C1. Investment received**

Investment Proposals received in Bihar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Investment Proposals received in Bihar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>25000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>15000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15(June)</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Investment proposals received by the state was 20,000 crore in 2012-13. This declined to to 2,290 crore in 2013-14 and 657 Crore in 2014-15 (till June). (Mishra 2014)

C2. Investment Approved

![Investment in Bihar graph]

The State Investment Promotion Board (SIPB) got proposals worth Rs 17,452 crore in 2012-13. It dropped to Rs 6,059 crore in 2013-14. (Mishra, Bihar Starts to slide downhill 2014)

C3. Number of registration of Units in Bihar

![Number of Units Registered graph]
During 2012-13, 3737 new units were registered in the state. It went down to 3133 in 2013-14. The new units were 3962 in 2011-12. Thus there is a sharp decline in the newer ventures in the state. (Government of Bihar 2015)

D. Increasing Fiscal Deficit

The Central government is emphasising on Financial Prudence (Parsai 2014), yet the state government has increased public debt, thus increasing dependency on centre. The central government is trying to restrict fiscal debt to 3% of the GDP, Bihar is still in debt of 26% compared to its GDP. Bihar’s Debt was 57,474 Crores in 2012-13 which increased to 75,416 in 2014-15. Thus, there is an increase of 31% in debt when the state grew at 8.82% in the same period. The debt in the state has doubled in last 5 years.

*Source(table 7.8 from Bihar Economic Survey)*
E. Per Capita NSDP (net state domestic product)

In Bihar, The growth rate has declined marginally. The Per capita NSDP growth rate was 9.3% between 2012 - 2013. It went down to 8.56% between 2013-14. According to the Bihar Economic survey, It reached a highest of 13.45 in 2010-11 (Government of Bihar 2015).

F. Crime figures

*Source (Bihar Police 2015)
The crime figures of the state has almost reached the times of ‘Jungle Raj’ (PTI 2015). 21% rise in rape cases, 16% in kidnappings in 2013 over 2012. Bihar’s crime graph no better in Nitish era (Gupta 2015).

The number of robbery cases recorded in 2012 was 1,266 which increased to 1,600 in 2014, registering an increase of 26 per cent. The total number of kidnapping cases increased from 4,737 to 6,570 which marked increase of 39 per cent. The number of rape cases increased from 927 to 1127 during the period, which was an increase of 22 per cent. Cognizable Crime increased to 1,90,000 in 2014 from 1,60,000 in 2012, an increase of almost 19%. Burglary has increased from 3600 to 4200 (2012 to 2014). Event the number of Theft has increased from 17000 to 23000 which is an increase of 35%. (Bihar Police 2015)

G. Disturbed Communal Harmony

*Source (Suresh 2015)*
There has been a substantial increase in number of Riots in Bihar. According to the official figures from Bihar Police website, there were 9768 riots in 2011, this increased to 13566 in 2014 (Bihar Police 2015).

**There has been three-fold increase in communal riots in the state after the split of JDU-BJP** (Suresh 2015). Most of these incidents are clashes sparked off by clearly deliberate triggers: dumping of animal parts in places of worship (pigs near mosques, beef near temples); provocative sloganeering during processions passing through Muslim-majority neighbourhoods; and communalisation of even trivial incidents such as a dispute during a cricket match as to who was hit by a ball; vandalism of idols (Suresh 2015). The Indian Express reports - Since January 2010, for the last three and a half years that the BJP and Janata Dal (United) were together in power, there were 226 “communal incidents” across Bihar — incidents where Hindus and Muslims, the two largest religious groups in the state, were pitted against each other. Each incident was recorded by the local police station and classified as “communal”. (Suresh 2015)

**H. Decline in the implementation of Public Welfare Schemes**

**H1. Kisan Credit Car issued**

2012-13 The govt. set the target of reaching out to 27,00,000 (27 lakh) farmers and accomplished 82% of the target reaching out to 22,31,786. In 2013-14 government set the target of 35,13,612 and reached 25,14,763 and accomplished only 71.6% of the target (Bihar Economic Survey 2015).Thus the state government failed to reach to about 30% of the targeted beneficiaries after the split of the two parties.

**H2. Financial aid to entrepreneurs**

During 2012-13, 596 entrepreneurs were benefitted from the Udyog Mitra program of the government. The number of beneficiaries went down to 583 in 2013-14. The program peaked in 2011-12, 753 entrepreneurs were benefitted. Thus, proving the fact that a stable government worked on the welfare of people. (Bihar Government 2015)
I. Investment in infrastructure

II. Slower completion of Projects

There was a sudden lull in the infrastructure projects in the state. In 2009-10, Bihar Rajya Pul Nirman Nigam completed 233 projects, in 2010-11 it completed 195 projects, in 2012-13 it completed 136 projects. In 2013-14, it completed about 119 projects (Bihar Government 2015).
J. Decline in construction of Roads

![Bar chart showing kilometers of road constructed from 2010-11 to 2013-14](chart)

*Source: Bihar Road construction Department*

The kilometres of road built annually saw a dive after the split. In 2006-07, Bihar completed 337.00 kms of newer road. This rose to 383.35 kms of newer road in 2010-11. Yet in 2012-13, Bihar made only 33.00 kms of newer road. It dived back to 192.00 kms in 2013-14.

K. Implementation of Rural sanitation program

![Bar chart showing school toilets and anganwadi toilets from 2011-12 to 2013-14](chart)

In 2011-12, 22,575 new school toilets and 1521 Anganwadi toilets were made. The state government worked in the same pace and made 17,009 School toilets and 4822 Anganwadi toilets in 2012-13. However, the number of the newer toilets suddenly decreased to 5076 school toilet in 2013-14 and 1437 anganwadi toilets (Sulabh 2015).

This is in contrast with the fact that Bihar still has the least number of toilets in school. Only 70% of the schools has boys and 58% of schools have girls toilet (Salve 2015).
L. Reduced disparity in income – Gini’s coefficient

The income inequality has substantially decreased in last decade in the state (Aiyar 2011). The data available from the planning commission website indicates that Bihar has been able to significantly low the income disparity in the state (Planning commission 2014).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>0.340</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>0.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andhra Pradesh</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td>0.319</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td>0.331</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>0.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arunachal Pradesh</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>0.291</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>0.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assam</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.296</td>
<td>0.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bihar</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>0.307</td>
<td>0.319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chattisgarh</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td>0.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td>0.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goa</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>0.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarat</td>
<td>0.334</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>0.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haryana</td>
<td>0.291</td>
<td>0.310</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>0.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himachal Pradesh</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>0.410</td>
<td>0.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jammu &amp; Kashmir</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>0.334</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>0.291</td>
<td>0.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jharkhand</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>0.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karnataka</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.291</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td>0.342</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>0.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerala</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td>0.358</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.371</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>0.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madhya Pradesh</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.270</td>
<td>0.331</td>
<td>0.377</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.337</td>
<td>0.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipur</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>0.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meghalaya</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mizoram</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>0.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagaland</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>0.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odisha</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>0.342</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>0.334</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.334</td>
<td>0.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>0.270</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>0.360</td>
<td>0.270</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>0.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajasthan</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.340</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>0.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikkim</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>0.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil Nadu</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>0.310</td>
<td>0.319</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.347</td>
<td>0.307</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>0.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripura</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>0.296</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td>0.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uttar Pradesh</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>0.296</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td>0.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uttarakhand</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0.337</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td>0.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Bengal</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>0.284</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.291</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td>0.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;N Islands</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>0.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandigarh</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.341</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.449</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>0.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dadr &amp; N. Haveli</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danar &amp; Diu</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>0.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakshadweep</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>0.322</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td>0.279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M. Health Indicators

Bihar still occupies bottom level in various health parameters. “There is significant dearth of specialist doctors. Moreover, there are severe misallocations of the specialist doctors and lack of manpower support, equipment and basic infrastructure within the public health system causing serious challenges in effective provisioning of specialist services for maternal and child health care” (PTI 2015)
### M1. Specialist Doctors

As on March 2014, Bihar had only 0.83 specialist doctors per million population in the CHCs (community health center), DH (District Hospital) and Sub district hospitals (SDHs) where the national average is 3.98. (PTI 2015)

### M2. Health Care facilities

Bihar had 533 community health centre in 2009. The number has remained the same till 2004 (PTI 2015). It is found that number of Community Health Centres per million people is significantly low in Bihar (0.67) compared to the national average (4.43). It is also observed that all Bihar (17.83) is below the national average (20.74) in terms of total and rural government hospitals per million people (PTI 2015).

Bihar (20.92 per million population) in terms of paramedical staff at all levels perform poorly as compared to the average of the nation (62.16 per million population) in government health care centres (PTI 2015).

### M3. Infant Mortality Rate

Infant mortality rate is another reflection of the fact that Bihar continues to perform poorly in health parameters. In the above table, it is clear that that Bihar has performed poorly in infant mortality rates over the past decade. The infant mortality rate in 2012-13 was 42 which is higher, compared to the national average of 40. (Government of BIHAR 2015)
8. Conclusion

Year 2013 marked a significant change in the politics of Bihar. With the forced exit of BJP from alliance govt headed by Nitish Kumar, the quality of Governance in Bihar suffered the most. Politics of Bihar underwent a major change ‘from Politics of Performance to the Politics of Populism’.

When ideology and policy driven politicians exit from Ministerial positions, what remains is nothing more than a game of routine power-grabbing. All key development indicators analysed in this study underscore the fact that split of the BJP-JDU has impacted highly negatively on the quality of governance and thereby the lives of the people of Bihar. An undoubtedly negative trend is seen in all the key development parameters post-BJP exit, examined in the report.

The sudden decline in the growth rate and investor sentiments is an evidence of the poor handling of State economy post-BJP exit. It empirically suggests that the post-BJP exit, government continued bereft of able and experienced Ministers, its leadership lost focus, and utterly confused, it changed its priorities. Potential investors eventually, were highly discouraged and the government took no substantial decision to improve the market
sentiments. What was worst was the fact not only big investors but small traders, marginal farmers, teachers and students too lost their confidence in the governance system in the State. The study also brings to the fire crass lethargy in the implementation of welfare programs in the state. There is a reduction in the number of new toilets after the split. This is in sharp contrast with the fact that Bihar still has the least number of toilets in schools compared to the national average. Only 70% of the schools has boys toilets and 58% of schools have girls toilets (Salve 2015). Furthermore, there is fallout in reaching the target for Kisan Credit Card as a proof that the government has neglected key developmental issues. The report explains as to how JDU shifted its priorities to garner short term benefits and the people of the state hugely suffered.

To put it in nutshell, forced exit of BJP for sheer vote-bank politics severely affected the Nitish Kumar Govt. This impact had three important dimensions. They were --

1. Stability of the State Govt heavily suffered as the new alliance that was hurriedly given some shape (JDU, RJD and Congress) lacked credibility. Clearly, it was an opportunistic alliance of ex-adversaries who had abused each other at several occasion and for a considerably longer time and hence it was never considered as an enduring partnership.

2. Under various direct and indirect pressures coming from new alliance partners Nitish Kumar administration had to compromise on several big and small issues, severely threatening the quality of governance.

3. Leadership is central to the idea of governance even in democracy. There is enough evidence to suggest that the break-up with BJP also impacted very adversely on the quality of govt.leadership. His working style changed, decisiveness diminished and confusion prevailed in many key policy areas. Leaving the reigns of state and handing them over to Shri Manjhi and soon, taking them back for no logical reasons is a significant case in point.
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