

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.

Democracy Riddles

1. The people would misunderstand and wrongly interpret that government to be the owner of the constitution and nation. This forms a highly potent reason for government/GPP to start conceiving the constitutional requirements by itself.
2. Two (or more) parties joining to form the government would have motives driven by 'selfish gains' therefore, to be 'discouraged and ruled out'. This evidently promotes depreciation of 'moral values & principled behaviour'
3. Pre-election tie-up: this would be highly unethical as P1 and P2 would intend to curse the voters/citizen supporting P3 (having maximum numbers) with a 'plot to provide' a government which doesn't have citizen base, just contrary to what 'democracy' would have been installed for.
4. Post-election tie up: the failure for anyone to form the government would lead to 're-poll' and again with no surety of anyone getting to the GBM mark even after that. So can be pulled on, if there is no rule that the political party with maximum winning candidates can run the government.
5. If more parties form government, this would be based on the principle of sharing equal responsibilities by those parties who are associated in a decision taken by a government or involved to cause a decision to have occurred, to be equally accountable towards the citizen of the nation/Laws.
6. All government decisions would be the responsibility of both (all) parties in the government. It would be mandatory for party 2 to support the actions/decisions of Party1 and also for Party 1 to support the decisions of Party2, openly and publicly and in government records.
7. The party with maximum numbers must be included and should lead the coalition.
8. Outside support: P1 party becomes eligible for forming the government (by reaching GBM collectively with P2), but the party P2 providing its numbers to P1, in not supporting/joining the government. P2 is not accountable for the decisions of the government. This is contrary not only to the

democracy but also against the basic principles of public governance accountability.

- 9. The party providing support from outside would not do so on the basis of its ideology. So it would provide support on other reasons other than the ideology and public service and the other reason would be 'selfish gains'.**
- 10. The Code of Governance/Constitution must have provision to prohibit this.**
- 11. It is recommended in other chapter that 'largest party' should form the government with provision of secret voting by OIGs in parliament for 'government decisions'.**

In normal course the strength of people's support can be assessed by the number of votes anyone would secure in elections. In political party system, it would turn out to be number of votes the party secured. However, in region based elections individuals contest for smaller regions, thus it becomes the number of candidates of a party who wins. Thus strength of the party and voters support can be viewed as the number of people in parliament after winning. And a minimum strength is also warranted for claiming government formation.

After the elections, **the PL turns into GPP and government would behave as if owner of the constitution.** Since the entity nation is not defined normally, the people unable to associate themselves with the nation or the government, get much separated from the government. Viewing as an outsider, **the people would misunderstand and wrongly interpret that government to be the owner of the constitution and nation. This forms a highly potent reason for government/GPP to start conceiving the constitutional requirements by itself.** A loosely framed and fragile structured constitution supports such action by the government.

No party reaching GBM:

There are some situations which significantly effect the formation of government after the elections and one of the most important is that none of the political parties are eligible, in terms of numbers, to form the government. Most of the COG insist for a 'majority' in the parliament, implying that the support of **minimum specified members,**

normally 66% (GBM- Government bench mark), should be available to the party which intends to form the government. And when no any single party, individually, can claim to have so many members, the possibility of two parties (or more) coming together would occur.

Selfish gains vs service

Ideally the people select a party and extend support because their ideology would coincide with the ideology of the party. Say for example party-1 has a base of people-1 because of ideology-1 similarly party-2 has a base of people-2 because of ideology-2. During elections and while seeking support of the people every party would have tried to project itself as the best and would have publicly criticized the policies and principles of other parties. Party 1 would have criticized publicly that Party2 is 'unwanted' and Party 2 also would have acted to call Party1 as 'undesirable'. Both would have put allegations on each other (or one another) that the other one is 'cheater'/ dishonest, during elections. Providing support by party-2 to Party-1 would be like accepting ideology of party-1 i.e. ideology-1 by party2, which would be against the people-2 who possess ideology-2 and party-2 therefore, betrays with people-2. Party2 would also 'unsay' all the allegation which they put on Party1 during elections, which will be unethical. The reverse analogy applies to party-1 also which would betray with people-1 by joining hands with party-2. Also party-2 cannot agree to the ideology-1 as it loses self identity and people-2 under such a situation. Therefore **PL2, Political leaders of party-2 would provide support to party-1 because of consideration other than ideology and ethics therefore, present an example of dishonesty and selfish gains.**

The same would apply to PL1 for obtaining support of party-2.

Thus an action, which evidently promotes depreciation of 'moral values' and 'principled behaviour', that too by the people who represents the nation, can not be said to be correct.

Pre election tie-up:(S1): It may so happen that conceiving their inability to stand to the level of GBM individually, two parties, or more, may decide to come together before elections and contest elections jointly. These two parties say P1, P2 once again, are two different entities having different principles. These were different and would remain different. Under all probability, these would come together to fail the third party P3 (or a group) from getting more numbers. Evidently, the P3 would be stronger than both P1 and P2 individually. And P1 and P2 forming alliance to prove that the citizen who have

faith in P3 and going to vote for it, are wrong and unworthy. **For sure, this would be highly unethical as P1 and P2 would intend to curse the voters/citizen supporting P3 with a 'plot to provide'** a government which doesn't has citizen base, just contrary to what 'democracy' would have been installed for.

There is no reason that it should be permitted as the beginning itself is driven with selfish motives.

Post election tie up: (S2): Another situation would be that after the elections, no party get to the GBM mark, and GBM is the constitutional requirement. And now P1 and P2 comes together to form the government.

As mentioned above, there is **no doubt that this also would be unethical**. However, **the failure for anyone to form the government would lead to 're-poll' and again with no surety of anyone getting to the GBM mark even after that**. Re-poll shall cause 'heavy financial burden' and 'loss of valuable time' and with no confirmation that it would not happen again.

This is a different situation therefore.

There are two possibilities. The first **(S2a)** is that, one party at least out of P1/P2 has secured the maximum number of candidates elected in elections. The largest part has the right to lead the government, thus it can be accepted with the condition that 'largest party' shall lead.

The other situation **(S2b)** would be that P3 party is the largest and both P1 and P2 have secured less elected candidates than P3. The intention of both P1 and P2 shall be, just to keep the largest party 'at bay'. As mentioned above this approach, shall be 'selfish gain' oriented and should be considered as 'unconstitutional'. Even if there is no party to support P3, to honor the decision of the citizen, the constitution should be duty bound to permit P3 to form government, at least for 3-4 months, a period in which P3 can bring out its plans and programmes to the citizen and the nation to prove its worth.

Largest party to form Government:

It is suggested in other chapter that invariably the 'largest winning' party should form the government irrespective of any definition of 'majority'/GBM. For each government decision, free and confidential 'opinion delivery' of all the 'members of parliament' or 'legislative assembly', as the case may be, should be adopted to adjudge suitability of decision.

Coalition parties accountability:

The government is responsible for the good governance to work for the welfare of the people. Looking at the same from the people's perspective, the people in the government are responsible for decisions towards the welfare of the people and thus **any body being in the government or causing a government action to happen, is accountable for government decisions. This would be the principle of sharing equal responsibilities by those who are associated in a decision taken by a government or involved to cause a decision to have occurred should be equally accountable towards the citizen of the nation.**

A political party comprising of people who would act to look for their prospects as owner of government powers, in principle should work for its ethics and principles which it revealed at the time of elections, and consolidated in the form of votes by voters who supported it. PL of political party, if not acting as per ethics and principles, the other reason for their action shall be 'selfish self-gains'.

If in a system it is mandatory to present a minimum number of 'members' by Party1 and the help of Party2 is essential, both Party1 and Party2 must work on a common platform where for **all government decisions would be the responsibility of both parties.** It would be therefore, **mandatory for party 2 to support the actions/decisions of Party1 and also for Party 1 to support the decisions of Party2, openly and publicly.** If they share the MOGs, Party 1 will have to support the decisions of MOGs of Party2, and Party2 shall have to support the decisions of the MOG of Party1, **again openly, publicly and on records of the government.**

Outside support:

The concept of providing **outside support by a political party** is also in practice in some countries, to increase the numbers, in a number based democracy, so that a particular party can form a government, even though being in minority by itself. The P1 party would form the government with all MOGs from P1 and party P2 shall only declare that it supports P1. This may be **one of the most unconstitutional and undemocratic concept introduced by the political parties for their convenience if clear definition and provisions in the COG constitution regarding formation of government in this manner is prohibited.**

A party P2 bargains with the other party P1 to extend support in a manner that **P1 party becomes eligible for forming the government (by reaching GBM collectively with**

P2), but the party P2 providing its numbers to P1, in not supporting the government. P2 is not accountable for the decisions of the government. This is contrary not only to the democracy but also against the basic principles of public governance accountability.

The other serious issue relates to the ethics. It is obvious that being different parties, the ideology of two parties would be different, therefore, **the party providing support from outside would not do so on the basis of its ideology. So it would provide support on other reasons other than the ideology and public service and the other reason would be 'selfish gains'.** The party P2 also exhibit 'mistrust in the policies of P1' by not joining in the government but still extends support which would have only one reason which is 'selfish gains'. The parties gets support from the people because the parties reflects their ideology, however, in this case the **behavior of a party is such which would not conform to the ideologies of the people supporting the particular party, which is acting from outside.**

Such arrangements are obviously uncalled for, to ascertain fairness, sincerity and selflessness in the government people GPP. **The CGO must have provision to prohibit this.**