

ISSN: 2278-9529



**GALAXY**

International Multidisciplinary Research Journal

November 2015 Vol. 4. Issue VI

[www.galaxyimrj.com](http://www.galaxyimrj.com)

Editor-In-Chief- Dr. Vishwanath Bite

About Us: <http://www.galaxyimrj.com/about-us/>

Archive: <http://www.galaxyimrj.com/archive/>

Contact Us: <http://www.galaxyimrj.com/contact-us/>

Editorial Board: <http://www.galaxyimrj.com/editorial-board/>

Submission: <http://www.galaxyimrj.com/submission/>

FAQ: <http://www.galaxyimrj.com/faq/>

## A No-Party Democracy

**Ramesh Chandra Tiwari**  
**Bahraich, Uttar Pradesh – India**

Most of the politicians live for themselves under the umbrella of selflessness but those who have the real spirit of living for the country are rare. Lord Krishna never enjoyed power and wealth; Acharya Kautilya is remembered because he did nothing for himself; Samrat Ashok dedicated his life to caring for his subjects; Chandra Shekhar Azad, Sardar Bhagat Singh and many other freedom fighters sacrificed their lives for their country. Scientists never knew they lived a life; a plant that has got to yield fruit sacrifices itself for the produce; a desert, however, soaks up all that falls on it.

Somebody has said: 'Democratic elections, after all, are not a fight for survival but a competition to serve'. But what often happens is that parties lose internal democracy and become the property of a particular family which ultimately starts using it as a family business aimed at making profits rather than serving the country and that the politicians dress up their ruthless ambition as a pursuit of public service, which common people do not understand and fall prey easily to hypocrisy. Consequently, the parliament every time gets filled with imposters and the actors whose personal lives always contradict the noble nature of their speeches.

It is expected that no matter which of the parties wins, both sides must tolerate one another and acknowledge that each has a legitimate and important role to play and agree to cooperate in solving the common problems of the society. But the parties deliberately avoid serious discussions and choose to present a show of cussing and shouting at each other with a view to disrupting the working of the incumbent. After all, why should there be any party in a democratic system when a group of mixed individuals can arrive at a better decision than a few groups of people each having similar aims and interests can, or when every independent MP can support or oppose the government more freely and fairly than a few groups of parliamentarians who are purely interested in party politics?

Religion consists of the laws that decide how to live in a society. By promising us God's love and blessings, it persuades us to love, help and tolerate each other, be true to each other, make an honest living, be kind to every creature, keep our body, heart, house and everything around us clean, speak the truth and what is comforting. A religion, however, does not have anything for politics, but it is a sad fact that the politics often usurp it and use it as a contrivance to polarize voters.

Often the rightwing parties distance themselves from the dirty deeds against religious places carried out by their henchmen and, as a result, a particular community is blamed for it. Similarly, it is not the people who want to show off their religious ceremonies but these parties that provoke them to. To come to light, one group of politicians deliberately courts controversy, particularly over a holy religion, and the other group at the same time comes forward to stir up feeling against it. Finally, faiths weep and the innocents who have faith are sacrificed. In short, election is a goddess that is happy when she is offered human sacrifices and eats thousands of people before she gives her blessing to a party.

It is human nature to dislike those whom we consider rich and to love listening to someone denounce those who are more competent than us. The leftwing parties also court hate campaigns and cause severe economic and social dislocation by dividing the electorate into the rich and poor and into high-caste and low-caste groups, thus damaging the work ethic among the poor. But the most obnoxious sort of politics is the one that involves favouritism towards a particular group of people, trying to win support by exciting their emotions rather than by using reasonable arguments and whipping up hatred between the castes.

In a multi-party democracy, the parties whose political strategies are based on polarization of voters rather than on their visions of development each do not often feel confident of facing a leading competitor on their own and form a coalition which has never proved successful, as it is often observed that a serious split in it appears soon after the elections and that a government by coalition has ever had its own set of problems of delaying further reforms or even blocking them together.

The party lines have detracted from the charm of democracy and consequently, it looks like a body that has no soul. It is no more for the people or of the people; yes, it is by the broken people. So to end such high-handedness, the parliament should be free of party members who are bound to obey a few policy-making persons whose job is to devise plans of dividing people in such a way as to ensure that they can gain the support of more than half of the electorate – no matter whether the rest of them are deprived of their dues. A self-described candidate would not prefer to divide or polarize voters; or if by chance he does, his activities will not have wider implications.

Party-based democracy is a curse because almost all the parties prevail upon both the rich and the poor to carry them to the power. The rich donate large sums to them and the poor vote for them. Certain parties use the greater part of the donation in distributing freebies among the poor so that they can seduce them. Then, as they come to power, they, for the next five years, feel free to take decisions in favour of the donors who in turn help them make their own pockets rich as well.

Since the common people have an unreasonable preference for the parties that dispense largesse to them, they never oppose them, even if they stake the whole country on it. Whereas all round development of the country is possible only when every hand works and every hand will work when nothing is free except for the welfare state. So, only independent candidates would not be able to lure their voters with handouts because no corporate would risk donating them until they form a group.

In a democratic system, every voter must be represented individually and not by their class of society, which is not possible in both two-party and multi-party system because the members are bound by the official view taken by their parties and thus they, though in great number, make yet a single unit. Now in a no-party system a self-governing parliamentarian would like to profess an interest in those who voted them instead of a particular class of society. They would also prefer to protest against an otherwise decision taken by the government. So, it is only in this system that the whole countrymen can have a fair representation in the parliament.

Sometimes a person at the forefront of an election campaign is so influential that in his/her name a large number of inept candidates of his/her party win the seats they otherwise would not be able to win, thus filling the parliament with those who simply follow a few big hitters and also with those who, soon as they come to power, start milking money from every possible source to fund a lavish life-style, rather than carrying out the duties for which they were elected.

Since party candidates stump up a lot of money and time to win an election and the winners are not certain to get another chance in future, they never fail to take the best advantage of their position just after assuming power. In a few cases, a prime minister or a few of his prominent ministers may intend to work with honesty but their honesty becomes meaningless when they fail to prevent such MPs of the party from involving themselves in frauds because in doing so they could be inviting the risk of them forming a group of rebels. But if the members are autonomous and the prime minister is one elected by all sorts of elected representatives of the people, they would not be able to blackmail the prime minister.

Embezzlement of public funds is one of the most serious crimes. The person, no matter what status, who is guilty of it, deserves punishment, but the parties apply double standards in the way they are tough on people and allow MPs to escape prosecution for fraud. If by chance a probe is launched, none but the people suffer once again and the politician at the centre of the wrong is not held liable. Sometimes party strategists become so bold that they do not even hesitate to take part in treasonable activities. Every time they get away scot-free because there is no regulatory system to control them except that the people can change the government in the next election, still with no real result as the new government starts doing the same or even worse than what the previous government had been doing; and also because, all the parties have mutual agreement to avoid taking legal action against each other.

It is not that they alone break laws, but also let the group of their supporters - whom they do not want to displease - do the same and the society gets plagued by muggings, thefts, assaults and murders. Now no government seems to be interested in taking decisions that are good for the society, rather they are busy inventing those policies that can break their opponents' vote bank or form their own.

So this is not a democracy in which people are helpless against a few flocks of elected officials and treated as a meadowland, when their rights should be above the convenience of the office-holders? Now the only option that the people have got is to form a new system of democracy in which there will be no party at all, only those who have once won a seat on a local council election can be eligible to contest the state assembly or parliamentary elections as independent candidates and the members of parliament alone will not elect one of them to be a Prime Minister; instead, the aspirant MPs would have to contest a prime ministerial election in which the electors of the electoral college will be the entire elected representatives in state and federal governments and members of country's councils as well. Here one thing is very necessary and that is to spend any money on election campaigns and distributing freebies to the electorate must be regarded as unforgivable crimes and candidates must not be allowed to change his/her constituency in following elections.

You cannot keep your house clean forever by only cleaning it once, assuage your hunger for the whole life by only eating once, be called a learned by going to your school only a day, so how can you believe that you will control your government by only electing it once every five years or that you are independent ever since the Independence Day? In fact, you need to keep a constant hold on your government by fighting for your independence every day.

So, there should a president, directly elected by the people, to whom the people could lodge a complaint against their MPs. The president should have the authority to mete out punishment to the members of parliament including the prime minister. He should be free to pass judgement only in those cases where a light sentence is required, but where a heavy sentence is inevitable, he must have public opinion. In this system the people of the country will have an opportunity to get their representatives punished or sacked any time instead of waiting years for the elections in the vain hope that the new government would improve the situation. If the prime minister does something to injure the national interests and a large majority of people approve of his dismissal, the president on behalf of them can declare a midterm election of a new prime minister. Thus the government will govern the people; the people, meanwhile, will keep a tight rein on the government.