

## Democracy Assurance Union

The first vital question would be 'whom democracy is made for'? And what would be the main objective of such an arrangement?

There are three elements in a democracy. Government (Leader), people and the country. Analyzing if further, let us understand significance of democracy for these three. Democracy is for whom, country? The country has two representative faces, land and the people. Land is a passive entity neither has a say for democracy or the system ruling over it nor have a feel for it. Leaders? If Democracy is for leaders? A leader is a person identified over and above the common people. Thus becomes an elevated and isolated person and standing alone does not represent the democracy. Even if a leader has been elected by the people, only a fraction of whole lot, after being elected, it may act only as an individual caring for its own interests first, thus democracy cannot be evolved for 'Leaders'.

**The democracy therefore, is for the people.** The democracy is for people of the country. And objective of 'Democratic assurance system' or with constitutional powers let us call it 'Democracy Assurance Union'-DAU, would be to install 'citizen oriented democracy'.

### Why DAU required:

It is elaborated in various chapters that due to selfish behavior of Government people(GPP), emerging out of their 'insecurity' and attitude of 'self-gains', the GPP may behave in selfish manner and use the 'government's powers and authority' for self gains. It is also elaborated that the 'government people should have only one objective of 'providing service to the citizen', for coming to the government positions, however, **it is clarified that if the GPP is not working for providing 'service to citizen' then they are working for 'self gains'**. And there are fairly **good chances of such happening especially with the government 'keeping the term public service' undefined and ambiguous.**

**If government 'acts undemocratic', who would check it. An entity conceived and named 'Democracy Assurance union' to represent its 'constitutional character.**

**The people are not the leaders, but ideal democracy should place them at the ranking of leaders and leaders should be placed at the ranking of the people.** In case of democracy, the thinking and actions of the leaders should be in the interest of the people, the thinking and **the actions which are DAVM so that verification and measurement is possible by the citizen.** The people would decide the leader's action and leader should feel happy by doing so. However, the public is a heterogeneous mixture of human beings and their unity may be fragmented. The major contradiction may be if their perception of an action differ from the perception of well being of the nation or other constituents of the nation. It is therefore, necessary to design a system not only for the people to believe it to be so, but realizing the overall nation's approach for welfare of the people as a whole, thus installation of 'Democracy'.

### Present scenario:

In a government system, usually a small organization is formed to deliver the task of 'arranging and managing elections'. The government would define 'conducting elections' only as the presentation and application of democracy. Let us name it EC. And this is 'all' what is

conceived to be the government's responsibilities for providing 'Democracy'. But this is unfair to the citizen and too little for 'providing democracy'. Let us describe it.

EC would be a constitutional body for various democratic functions, which should be carried out in a manner that the interest of the people and the spirit of democracy is protected, as fundamental principle of governance. However, the formation of a body and assigning the function of 'managing elections' only, like EC itself defy the fundamentals of democracy. **Election is only one activity related to democracy and not the only activity.**

We get back to the, so called, most important democratic activity, **as it is presented to the people normally, 'elections'**. The constitutional purpose and duty of EC is to conduct fair elections. However, lack of explanation for the term 'fair' also makes the action of EC subjective. **The EC would find it most convenient to derive their own meaning. Fair election would imply for them, as per practice, printing of ballot papers, producing ballot box, appointing government machinery counting the papers and announcing the result. A very -very passive exercise it is.** However, this activity has become the core of democratic process, accepted by everyone. Most passive as no further thought process ever applied to modify this or restructure it. And it may further continue for next many many years. The passiveness and apathy of this unit has very serious consequences i.e. the subversion of democracy itself, the retention of which is the prime purpose and objective of EC. Let us look at it how it happens.

### **Democracy Assurance concept**

Have we ever thought of assigning 'responsibility and accountability' attributes to EC. Let us start with the objective and responsibilities EC would have to the citizen and the nation. The purpose of EC would be expressed as **to ensure that right person with desired attribute to act in a manner good for the nation and its citizen, reaches the decision making place through an absolute transparent process trusted by the people and the voters.** Let us critically analyze these requirements.

First, Right person with desired attributes reaches the place: So the COG should outline the attributes which are desired. **Based upon the same, or may EC do it independently' under ICE,** the EC should define attributes of the 'contestants' in the election, uniform criteria to assess their attributes and assessment through a transparent and fair process. **The attributes must be DAVM form as regards to, citizen welfare, anti-anti social, anti-anti national, law abiding, anti-crimes, honesty, transparency, social accessibility etc. And this should be notified on public domain.**

In the absence of the same, it would not be a surprise if the statistics of elected candidates have the background of major crimes with criminal court cases going on, person behaving anti-social, participating in violent agitations, spitting fire and bad-words for others, ill mannered. **If the elected members, any, have such attributes, background and even charges of murders, kidnapping, rape, corruption etc. it is obvious that EC is failing in 'presenting the democracy to the nation.** And it would continue for years and decades. Who cares!

The entity responsible for 'presenting democracy' to the nation must be assigned 'responsibility' of 'preserving democratic values' and the **first action would be to design the criteria so that persons who are free from all aberrations, blots of crimes, anti-social**

**activities etc can participate. An entity like the 'Democracy assurance union' DAU is therefore, conceived with assigned obligation represented by the name itself.**

With the definition given to the purpose, it should be EC responsibility. The excuse of not something being defined in procedures and non-availability of powers, may come up to overlook this obligation. However, obviously, the approval of a candidate's profile is given by the 'EC', or we now talk about DAU, for its candidature which is done in a manner that anyone would reach the 'house. **The DAU should critically examine the profile and first of all, make it public for observation of the people.** The profile should be checked against observations from the people and **candidate to be reexamined for serious allegations.** The profile must be designed that candidate is not able to EC should seek details from the courts if there are pending cases against the candidate and the rating in minus points should be loaded to the profile with a maximum acceptable limit beyond which the candidature must be cancelled. **For every candidate, this minus scale rating should be made known widely in public especially in the constituency. At least everyone in the constituency must have seen presentations/notifications by DAU/EC that the candidate was having any such attribute which is undesirable. It should be notified on TV, Newspapers, announcements, public notifications by DH etc.** This is just presentation of FACTS which should not have any deterrent. Instead of looking for an authority for developing systems and procedure to validate the purpose of its existence, **DAU should only check if there is any law or instructions which prevent DAU to do it.** If not **DAU would do whatever necessary to install best form of democracy, as its obligation.** How there can be a law preventing DAU to find out facts and make the facts public with wide publicity for the information of the people and the voters. DAU will do it, if it is working for the people and thus for the nation. **If DAU/EC does not do it, it is working for the candidates, individuals, especially helping those who do not qualify. Are the procedures and units really favoring the candidates who do not qualify on merit basis?**

### **Make people cast vote**

The next exercise for DAU is to develop incentive to the people to vote. Have you seen a polling booth from inside. The desk where marking is being done on the ballot paper by the voters is a card board or cover of paper sheet placed vertically less than two feet high. If the actions of the voter watched critically, perhaps, it can be made out, where the marking has been done. That desk is the place where the entire government formation takes place. **DAU would develop a design for the marking desk which can keep sufficiently away and hidden the voters from rest of the world.** It would have many more features to build up voters confidence in this activity. There is no reason that why the voters should not be hidden upto eyes level so that his/her eyes and the arm movement cannot be traced. **And over everything the activity should represent the election being a serious process and not a casual presentation.**

If there are polling booth capturing, the ballot box looting, criminals preventing people from casting votes, bogus casting of votes etc reported, how the people would get encouragement for going to the polling booth. The main issue here is, has EC (or DAU) ever presented the solution which was looked as foolproof by the people or did the EC plan and gear up in a period as long as 5 years, to eliminate such incidents. If not, the citizen is not at fault. Even spending huge amount on advertisements (which has reach only to educated people may be

10%) by government would become objectiveless if such confidence is not inspired into common citizen. DAU would be under obligation to do it.

### Performance of Elected GPP

One of the most disappointing deficiency which appears and deliberately being unattended, is the performance of the elected members, those who represents the people and nation. And there may be no entity having assigned this responsibility. The hypothesis behind this may be that there are two categories of people, law (Rule) makers (masters) and law (Rule) followers(slaves). The law makers since, makes the law, they are free not to abide by it. **The application of laws on masters therefore remains a theory which needs substantiation for its application.** It is derived in other chapter that there should be more stringent laws and/or norms of compliance for GPP.

The reasoning may be presented, that masters are also human being and thus the same set of laws as applicable to slaves are applicable to them. This may seem to be very fascinating but is it so. For example the 'master' shall make laws in which human witness is the most important decision making point. Or in other words **human witness keeps it a 'Law' otherwise it is 'unlaw'**. We must keep in mind that a judge's natural duty and responsibility is to deliver only 'justice' **therefore anything delivered by a judge which is not justice is 'injustice'**. This is elaborated in 'Justice system'. Now the scenerio is different for master and slave. Whereas a human witness will come forward to be witnessed and to be evidenced against a slave, no human witness will come forward to be evidenced against a master. In the history of King and Praja system, how many times a praja man would have witnessed against the king and to support a victim, another prajaman. Very rare it would be. **So the same laws and the same testimony process if applicable to Masters (Kings) and the slaves (Public), these will always favour the masters.** The simple reason is that masters have more authority to influence the structure/making of laws and also the laws handling mechanism, **which eventually is also designed by them.** The laws and their application on masters need to be more stringent, straight, transparent, swift, discouraging to masters and encouraging to slaves to have impact.

In the absence of such stringent framework of laws, what could be the mechanism to check the actions of GPP and by whom within the existing structure and systems. The agency which is promoting a common person, even without certifying their suitability, shall have to feel responsible. **DAU/EC must have designed its 'suitability criteria/certificates' carrying its constitutional obligations**, to ascertain that no 'anti-social, anti-national, absurd, MUBI character can pass through. DAU have the constitutional obligations and must carry it through. Keeping aside the passive gesture of 'its not my job', the DAU/EC, as a maker/ master of designing appropriate principles, has to take up this. Again instead of finding out what empowers to do so, they should find out what prevents them to do so, in the interest of nation and spirit of democracy.

And normally there will be no constitutional & democratic norm which would prevent them to do so. **DAU must device procedures to make measurement of intentions, attitudes and approach of the candidate, against pre-defined and pre-notified criteria, covering past anti-social' activities, affiliations with criminal base etc and the 'behaviour' during the elections.** The **DAU must bring out every details to the information of the people, as its duty**, assess score on the basis of criteria and notify it with all details. **DAU would also have**

**pre-notified criteria to assess 'behaviour' of the candidates and publish 'rating' virtually everyday during elections. DAU would take note of 'abusive language, presentations without DAVM projection or achievements, use of religion or caste or....., condemning, scold at others without presenting DAVM evidence (to DAU which can be asked for), using bad language etc.** These should be made public applying uniformly to all candidates.

This is candidates commitment to welfare CCW (in DAVM terms), shall be the charter announced by him/her. If the candidate is supported by a party the party should endorse the objectives and also confirm that the financial assistance to be provided to the candidate to achieve the objectives if party is able to form the government. This will be party's commitment for welfare PCW (in DAVM terms only). **Both CCW and PCW should be submitted to DAU to be checked against National agenda (NAG) agreed by candidate and party. This will form benchmark to check the performance of the candidate and the party when it becomes a member. The EC would keep on verifying the achievements of objectives/commitments which essentially to be measurable, certify and make it public to the people of the constituency for necessary checks at their end. The rule of thumb is if anything not done completely, it 'not done'.**

**Candidate's review** In order to keep the democratic practice and spirit to live further beyond , the performance of candidates against their agenda presented during elections need to be scrutinize periodically, every year by obtaining DAVM goals and monitoring achievements. **The elected GPP must essentially, under necessary rules structured by DAU, submit its performance/achievements DAVM terms, every six months, against the goals announced by him/her.** The GPP can add new goals also. The goals must always be DAVM and non-DAVM objectives/goals should be rejected by DAU straightway, treating this as intentional non-conformance of rules by GPP. **The most important aspect is that everything is notified to public and on public domain.** The goals and performance criteria would be based upon achievements against issues in the National agenda, social agenda, regional agenda, economic agenda for society, empowerment agenda for the society, compliance of constitution agenda, public responsibility agenda ( law & order, police services) code of conduct agenda, official behavior agenda, social behavior agenda , disipline agenda, public welfare agenda. The public behavior, language for others, laws/rules obedience, social harmony and social reforms etc shall also form the basis for DAU to assess and declare the score. All criteria must be pre-announced and notified to citizen and to all GPP before elections or immediately after the poll-results are announced, and uniformly applicable to all candidates/elected GPP.

Let we also see the major deterrent which would come in way preventing DAU to do it. The same people as working in other government departments comes to DAU/EC, thus presumably politically addicted and biased and not realizing their 'uncompromised commitment' to democratic governance values. However, those who are in DAU are accountable to public and the COG directly. Thus there has to be a difference in view point for self-responsibilities and administrative accountability between the two. They already have affection or hatred for different political representatives and units and can not act impartially assigning same level of responsibility to all the political parties and their representatives. Maintaining low level of accountability towards the public especially if the authority orientation is high, in other postings, they would maintain low accountability level towards public in EC too.



**There is no doubt that EC can only function independently and politically unpolarized if it works free of any political and government influence. DAU ideally should work under the ICE.** (It is brought out in other chapters that Justice system, DAU and Investigating agencies should be under ICE.) This will provide 'ICE' an active constitutional role instead of a very passive role assigned normally.

### **Political party evaluation**

EC would also undertake registration/recognition of political parties which is an administrative activity and not constitutional democratic activity. In ideal democracy, there should be no place for partyism or parties in 'elections'. It is brought out in different chapter that the government people/representatives **should reach the parliament (constitutions house) based upon merits of an individual** to decide things independently or as per their choice keeping in view the people welfare **without any externalities, like party influence**. They should treat every other member their colleague and act with them impartially and without ill feelings of being from different party (or may be different religion, if any party is based upon a religion) etc. So the division of 'members' into different parties for the purpose of 'governance', itself goes against true democracy and if a constitutional body like EC does it, its not in the true spirit of democracy.

However, political parties exist in almost all democratic systems and important activity DAU/EC has been controlling is registration of political parties. The application for registration of a party is submitted and obviously the objectives and goals of the formation of proposal party are highlighted in the application. In order to show and claim that virtually the aim of formation of the party is to look after every possible interest of every individual, the agenda would cover hypothetical, contradictory, impractical objectives. Did anyone ever felt concerned about this, neither the approving authority before granting registration, nor the party after obtaining the registration. **DAU should assess a rating mechanism for each political party based upon the 1. Strength of the objectives citizen welfare/ social harmony/ social upgradation etc 2. No anti-social anti-national components in it 3. DAVM parameters for assessment every year and 4. Commitment to submit goals accomplished in DAVM terms every six months. This is most vital instrument to gauge, the justification for a party coming into existence and also to measure the performance of a party which goes totally ignored both by authorities and the party throughout.** Even though this would be the most important parameter while designing the format of registration form, its applicability is not questioned and challenged while granting registration. **DAU must have DAVM goals envisaged against objectives declared by the party every year and then monitor the performance. DAU should notify such goals and performance, to the public and furnish its observations if the achievements by political party meet with the specified objectives, how much?.**

DAU would question the applicability and sincerity of the claimed objectives and also validate it against past behaviors of the party/ its representatives. Other aspects should be to see that if the party is registered with some person at the centre of fulfilling the requirements of the objectives claimed by the party, what would happen to the party if the person happens to leave the party. It also goes parallel to the analogy which is very prevalent, where an individual is projected as owner of a party and party's performance is apprehended as its performance. It should be clearly defined by the if the person leaves the party (or no more), will the party be deregistered or otherwise.

The agenda furnished by the party of its own and approved & accepted by authority on behalf of the nation, to make it a part of democratic process, DAU should make the agenda public for information of all. That becomes the start of the democratic process and not the end.

In order to keep the democratic practice and spirit to live further beyond , the performance of party's against their agenda need to be scrutinize periodically, every year. The performance criteria would be based upon their achievements against issues in the National agenda, social agenda, regional agenda, economic agenda for society, empowerment agenda for the society, compliance of constitution agenda, public responsibility agenda ( law & order, police services) code of conduct agenda, official behavior agenda, social behavior agenda , disipline agenda, public welfare agenda. The most important is to remove all subjectivity, and generality in party's performance statement and the claimed achievements should have details like numbers, locations, calculations in a form in which the people of all categories can understand it , but also verify if from the sites, This will be presented by the party's to the public and it shall be obligatory on part of recognized media to verify it and comment. The party will present it like the company presents its balance sheet to the stake holders. The performance index of the party shall be calculated/ assessed by EC against designated criteria, by assigning marks/ weight against different obligation under their agenda and present to the public. The must be the basis for EC to assess if a party is suitable for being national party, regional party or 'no party' etc. The party should be declared unfit for contesting elections if it has failed to secure even the minimum level for its said and declared acceptable objectives. If this party is permitted to contest election, not only this party but other parties also would try to contest elections by providing some undue, improper and one time benefits limited to the section of voters instead of working on larger agendas with established performance. And passiveness of DAU/EC would be the origin of this incentive.

The most important is to remove all subjectivity, and generality in party's performance statement and the claimed achievements should have details like numbers, locations, calculations in a form in which the people of all categories can understand it , but also verify if from the sites, This will be presented by the party's to the public and it shall be obligatory on part of recognized media to verify it and comment. The party will present it like the company presents its balance sheet to the stake holders. The performance index of the party shall be calculated/ assessed by EC against designated criteria, by assigning marks/ weight against different obligation under their agenda and present to the public. The must be the basis for EC to assess if a party is suitable for being national party, regional party or 'no party' etc. The party should be declared unfit for contesting elections if it has failed to secure even the minimum level for its said and declared acceptable objectives. If this party is permitted to contest election, not only this party but other parties also would try to contest elections by providing some undue, improper and

one time benefits limited to the section of voters instead of working on larger agendas with established performance. And passiveness of DAU/EC would be the origin of this incentive.

.....

Note: This is a modelling, done based upon analysis of existing facts and evolving reasoning, as to how the 'Government' and 'Constituents of Governance' are likely to behave and function 'influenced by normal human attributes' under different 'probable conditions' and does not imply projection or criticism of 'any particular government system in the world'. Any explanation in this 'coinciding with any working Government system' shall be an unintentional coincidence only.

Bhanoo P Verma