

## American Capitalism

by A K N Ahmed

*The market is an assiduous servant of the wealthy but an indifferent servant of the poor. As a result, it pours energy and resources into the multiplication of luxuries for which wealthier classes offer a market while allowing more basic needs of the poor to go unheeded and unmet. This is not only an economic but also a moral failure for any capitalist system.*

AFTER the collapse of communism and the downfall of Soviet Russia a sort of euphoria about American capitalism has been prevailing in the United States. Before being swept away by such a feeling for too long, Americans should recognize two facts viz. capitalism has always been a failure for lower classes but it is now falling for middle classes as well in USA and that in its competition with socialism it has merely prevailed and not triumphed. Even if it is a triumph it is, to quote professor Samuelson, a "triumph of mixed economy over bumbling bureaucracies." While assessing the prospect of American capitalism, in fact, any existing capitalist economy one needs to turn back to problems US economy has encountered before. There are three such problems that will affect the operation of American capitalism in coming years.

First, one has to recognize that the market is as an inefficient instrument for providing the society with those goods and services for which no price tag exists, such as education or local government services, or public health facilities. A market society buys such public goods by allocating a certain amount of taxes for these purposes. Its citizens however tend to feel those taxes as an extraction in contrast with the items they voluntarily buy. Too easily therefore a market society underallocates to education, public health or recreation since it has no means of bidding funds into these areas in competition with the forcible means of bidding them into automobiles or clothes or personal insurance. This private opulence and public squalor exists side by side.

A second failing of the market system is its application of a strictly economic calculus to the satisfaction of human wants and needs. The market is an assiduous servant of the wealthy but an indifferent ser-

vant of the poor. As a result, it pours energy and resources into the multiplication of luxuries for which wealthier classes offer a market while allowing more basic needs of the poor to go unheeded and unmet. This is not only an economic but also a moral failure for any capitalist system. Finally, a number of macro and micro ills like inflation, unemployment, poverty and pollution that are now persisting in American society are all to some degree the products of the market imparts to social process.

Looked at from this angle there are enormous economic problems which American capitalism has to solve if it has to have a durable existence. There is the lurking threat of depression and inflation — the still far from resolved problem of the instability of the system. There is the newly-arisen challenge of globalization of the market altering the economic geography of production in ways that threaten the foundation of many nation states. There is the teetering issue of the dependency of the poor countries on the richer ones. There is the ambivalent promise of technology bringing material well being as well as ecological danger of economic growth and employment shrinkage, of equitable distribution of wealth and technology generated by USA among all nations.

The problem is that the resolution of these issues whose outcome will so profoundly affect the prospects of American capitalism cannot be solved within the existing mindset of American politicians and economists who have seen for the last 30 decades nothing constructive in government's role — only waste or inefficiency and are now imagining that the public sector in 21st century would play a smaller role than in the 20th century. This perception will strike any dispassionate

observer as a view that flies in the face of history and that ignores the clear lessons of the present.

If capitalism is to work in the long run, it must make investments that are not in any particular individual's immediate self interest but in the human community's long run self interest. History shows us that very different balances between public and private and between consumption and investment are possible but it also shows us that it is not possible to run a good society without a balance in both areas. As Lester Thurow has rightly observed, "All public the model of communism does not work. All private, the model of feudalism and the implicit model of capitalism also does not work. Neither all consumption nor all investment can work. In the era ahead capitalism will have to create new value and new institutions that allow a new strategic balance in each of these areas."

It should also be clearly understood that when economic values dominate politics, liberty is often at risk and that the new economics of capitalism is no less illiberal than the old one of Marxism. What unites the Americans in the present and in turn unites the present with the past is a single deep rooted belief that every hard-working person who perseveres can find a respected place in society. Put another way if James Madison and other founding fathers of American republic returned today they would ask how well the nation measures up to the precept that the opportunity to attain economic independence and advancement be

available to all citizens.

This concept is different from the calculation of person's worth in the market place where there is only price but no value. George Soros, a billionaire operating in Global currency and stock market in one of the articles published in June 98 issue of *Atlantic Monthly* has observed that "Markets reduce everything to commodities. We can have a market economy but we cannot have a market society."

It is therefore time to recognize that while normal economic growth in USA has created millions of paying jobs over the years and will continue to do so the private sector alone cannot generate the full quota. Government action greater than what it already does is necessary. If the civic society in USA which is banded about so often in public discourse today is to be retained and protected a principle of equal moral worth of every individual has to be established by providing and maintaining basic welfare entitlements where necessary. This transcends and contains the forces of market which very often do not disrupt the bond of community of interest of people.

By now we all know that if ever a virtue was designed to be honoured in the breach it is loyalty in a society that worships the market in economics and freedom in politics. It is also time to understand clearly that if the development of a global, global economy the global capitalist society will not survive. Nor can we believe any longer that only a return to

a form of capitalism red in tooth and claw would deliver faster economic growth.

Those of us who are strong advocates of capitalism in America may perhaps be well advised to remember two things. One, even though democracy needs capitalism, capitalism does not need democracy. In fact, it is more comfortable with authoritarianism. Two, as Prof Galbraith has observed, "The achievement of socialism is not the achievement of socialists, modern socialists is the failed children of capitalism. So it will be in the years to come. Capitalism in America derives its legitimacy from two main sources. One has clearly been its widely acknowledged and acclaimed ability to satisfy the economic needs and wants of the great majority of citizens. The other has been a perceived complementarity between the workings in the economic sphere and the procedural rights and personal liberties in the political sphere."

But it is now increasingly becoming clear that market sovereignty and its political reflection in the splintered structure of public power — the supposed guarantees of liberal freedom — have themselves created under conditions of advancing capitalism growing barriers to the attainment of other ends of civil society — social welfare, social justice and acceptable political authority. The steep decline in the recent years of people's confidence in all public institutions and mega business concerns and their consequent alienation and disaffection are creating a sense of incompatibility in their minds between the oldest and most

liberal goal sought by Americans — freedom — and the other aims that were once thought to issue naturally from its attainment. More and more people now are arriving at the conclusion that this gap cannot be narrowed and that either freedom and economic efficiency must be sacrificed or the welfare state must not grow beyond a minimal size.

This is the dilemma, albeit mistaken one, that capitalism in America has to resolve if it has to have a durable life of its own. This task has been made more difficult by the fact that in the modern American society any step taken towards solution of the problem has to be justified. In the past solutions that work have traditionally dominated solutions that have ethical appeal. It is no longer so. Today to work it must be ethically defensible and this need imposes drastic limits on the set of feasible solutions.

The challenge before American capitalism therefore seems to be to devise an independent ethical principle that does not rely on the market for validation. Such principle in order to have broad adherence of the people should grant not merely the equal procedural rights associated with formal democracy but also substantive rights to fair share of economic goods, prestige and authority derived from the use as well as the intrinsic nature of labour and knowledge not derived from the power of money to buy rewards and influence unconnected to the merit of the purchaser. This seems to be a tall order for American capitalism judging the way it is going now where the winners take all leav-

ing nothing on the table for losers and where all gains are privatised but all losses are socialised.

Nevertheless efforts should continue to find some solutions to the key issues confronting American capitalism today. They are among others, evolutionary trajectory of management capitalism, persistent poverty and class division between classes and states, problems of the so-called excluded class and nations who do not have the means, material and otherwise to participate in social, economic and cultural life, the assault of globalisation on welfare capitalism, lack of synthesis between global economy and global society etc.

In short, the success of American capitalism in the coming century will depend first and foremost on learning how to use the two sectors of the economy as one — private enterprise providing the driving energy public capital the strong foundation for an economy that strives to be, both at home and abroad the world model that it ought to be. Indeed only by this way USA can demonstrate that the free market can close the triangle of political freedom, the creation of wealth and the fairness of distribution.

Can capitalism therefore be revised to be more independent ethical principle that does not rely on the market for validation. Such principle in order to have broad adherence of the people should grant not merely the equal procedural rights associated with formal democracy but also substantive rights to fair share of economic goods, prestige and authority derived from the use as well as the intrinsic nature of labour and knowledge not derived from the power of money to buy rewards and influence unconnected to the merit of the purchaser. This seems to be a tall order for American capitalism judging the way it is going now where the winners take all leav-

ing nothing on the table for losers and where all gains are privatised but all losses are socialised. Nevertheless efforts should continue to find some solutions to the key issues confronting American capitalism today. They are among others, evolutionary trajectory of management capitalism, persistent poverty and class division between classes and states, problems of the so-called excluded class and nations who do not have the means, material and otherwise to participate in social, economic and cultural life, the assault of globalisation on welfare capitalism, lack of synthesis between global economy and global society etc.

The task of economists today should therefore be not merely an enquiry into the condition of maximization under given constraints but also to suggest ways for removing those constraints when necessary.

The writer is a former governor of Bangladesh Bank

This is an excerpt from author's forthcoming book "USA Today and Tomorrow" to be published shortly.

## For a Consensus on Reforms

## Interview with India's Chief Election Commissioner M S Gill

THIS year India will see a series of State-level elections; and perhaps even a national one, should the Central coalition led by the Bharatiya Janata Party collapse. All of these will be carried out in a climate of religious intolerance unprecedented in degree. But curiously, little attention has been paid to the working of the body that will manage democracy during this politically fraught period. The reams of reportage provoked by former Chief Election Commissioner T.N. Seshan stand in stark contrast to the thin body of information there is on how the Election Commission actually works today. In what ways is a multi-member Election Commission different from the body Seshan once ran all by himself? What are its priorities and what is its understanding of its own role in the democratic system?

Chief Election Commissioner Manohar Singh Gill has presided over the Election Commission during some of the most difficult phases in Indian democracy, and in the history of the institution itself. Seshan led the Election Commission into a bitter confrontation with the democratic system itself, launching frontal assaults on politicians and political parties and repeatedly threatening to stall or even call off elections if his sky-high demands were not met. That confrontation led, in the end, to the creation of a multi-member Election Commission, with Gill and G.V.G. Krishnamurthy brought in by the P.V. Narasimha Rao Government for the express purpose of curbing Seshan's authority.

Seshan's reaction to this challenge was characteristic of the person once described on a Frontline cover as a "Bull In The Election Shop". He promptly challenged in the Supreme Court the appointment of the two new Election Commissioners, claiming that the appointment of more members on the Commission who could together outvote the Chief Election Commissioner was unconstitutional. Although Seshan lost that case, and the contours of the Election Commission were transformed forever, the institution suffered deeply. Seshan's bitter personal differences with the two new Commissioners surfaced time and again, and many people believed that in the process the authority of the Commission was undermined. After Seshan's retirement, many believed that the Election Commission had lost the ability to confront corruption in the election process.

In this exclusive interview to Frontline, Gill discusses in detail the working of the new multi-member system at the Election Commission. Far from subverting the institution's authority, he argues, the multi-member structure has in fact enabled it to respond to challenges with greater purpose and clarity. He addresses issues ranging from the progress made in updating and computerising electoral rolls to his radical, and inevitably controversial, plans for state funding of political parties and ending the entry of criminals into the democratic arena. Reform, Gill points out, is imperative if India's democratic system, in which political parties themselves have a deep stake, is to survive.

The interview given to Praveen Swami and N. Ram was conducted in an unusual setting. Gill, an ardent cricket fan and mountaineering enthusiast, spoke to Frontline in an elegantly appointed box perched high over the pavilion of the Chepauk stadium in Chennai over almost one and a half hours even as the first Test match between India and Pakistan approached its nail-biting climax. Discussions on the future of the Election Commission were punctuated by commentary on the state of play and broader issues of Indian cricket. Perhaps owing to the setting and the ambience, Gill was considerably more relaxed and reflective than he might have been in a formal interview. Excerpts:

What would you describe as the core achievements of the Election Commission after you became Chief Election Commissioner?

Well, the very first thing we worked for was to realise the objective of a three-member Election Commission, a multi-member Election Commission as they call it, working harmoniously and effectively for democracy. Indeed such institutions should, after 50 years of Independence.

While Article 324 of the Constitution allowed such an institution to emerge, we had only a one-member Commission for almost 48 years. I had always believed that almost 50 years on, with the political temperature having risen, these vast powers and duties could not be left to one person, no matter who he was. And I believe India has taken the correct decision for the next century by creating a three-member Commission. We are somewhat similar to a court bench in three judges, and go by majority decisions. I am only one-third of the Commission and am happy to be so, for if my colleagues disagree they must be right and I will go with them. I want India to focus on this, unfortunately in all our institutions *vyaaktigat* individualism is a big disease. Personalities, personality: this is there in the political parties, in the Cabinet, and even in cricket club committees. I am confident that I have the ability to persuade my two colleagues, through ideas which I believe carry weight. But if I cannot, I must be willing to obey their decision totally. The Election Commission's strength today lies in the fact that it is a single body. We may be three faces, but we are one. While we have equal powers, I believe good institutions do not work by voting, but through free debate leading to a

commonality of thought.

In making the Supreme Court judgment on the constitutional role of the Election Commission work, I believe we have played a historic role for the good of Indian democracy. We have instilled confidence in all parties that this is how things should be.

Is this an achievement of individuals, or an institutional project? In the past, there were bitter divisions between members of the Election Commission.

Since I became Chief Election Commissioner there have been no divisions. I do not wish to discuss the past. But you will appreciate that when there was a legal challenge to the very concept of a multi-member Commission, the commitment to put one in place was clearly lacking. I say this with all respect to my predecessor and colleagues. And what has been achieved now has been achieved, as much by my colleagues in the Commission as by me. In the process, the independence of the Commission has been strengthened.

How is this so? One man, no matter how much of a tiger he is or thinks he is, is amenable to pressure. We are all human. We can all be suborned. But a bench of three high officials, judges of a kind, is another matter altogether. India needs this. And another thing, which I hope people appreciate, is that while we must act with firmness, theatrical confrontations are not necessary. If that means we are soft, so be it. Softness and strength lie in action, not polemic.

So you see the Commission itself as a democratic body, a kind of mirror of the process it manages?

ease both in the public services and in the country as a whole. The records of the Commission show that everyone from the least to the highest in rank have been involved in debate. I welcome anyone standing up and telling me that I am totally wrong. If such criticism leads my colleagues and me to better ideas, that serves the Commission. The credit for these ideas after all comes to us, and I believe it deserves to be shared.

I might add that I do not believe good elections are conducted by the Election Commission, whether one-member or three-member. They are not even made possible by the State Chief Secretaries and Directors-General of Police, though God alone knows they work very hard. A general election with 800,000 polling stations and crores of voters is made possible by everyone from top Indian Administrative Service officers down to the Tehsildars and Block Development Officers. The system would never work without this totality of public servants. This is why I never claim the Commission has averted this or that crisis. It is really the work of many, many people. I am sorry to say that all parties barring none never open their mouths to say a good word about the public services of this country.

In concrete terms, what ideas do you believe the Election Commission has generated which will have a long-term impact on our democracy? One of the major things we have focused on, which is now coming to fruition, is the need for clean electoral rolls. These are fundamental to good elections, and all parties recognise this. All of them accuse each other of fudging the rolls and these kinds of things. What is the solution? The electoral roll, I believe, can only be cleansed if it is made accessible. It

should not just be stuck on the District Collector's notice board, where nobody reads it. It should be available to every party, every potential candidate, every critic, every voter, and for that matter every paan shop owner, easily and at all times. This brings information itself being out of corrections.

What we have done is to put voters' percentage on the list, to make the identification of false voters more easily possible. Number two, a new column has been added to the roll, to crosslink names with voter identity cards. And this electoral roll has been computerised. Haryana has completed the project and many other States have also more or less finished their work. We are putting computer systems in place right down to the Returning Officer level, which again is a task that has been finished in some States and should be completed elsewhere soon as well. Funds have been made available for this purpose, and both the Central and State governments have generally been very cooperative. You will soon have electoral rolls available to anyone in printed form and on CD-ROM, for which I will charge a few hundred rupees. Anyone is welcome to buy it, and catch the mischief their opponents may have played with the rolls. The fudging will die through these challenges.

Another important area of work is the voter identity card. As you know, the card was issued for 60 crore Indian voters in total. Without it, you go into the past of the card, I understood clearly that whichever way the idea had come about, it was a long-term necessity. India has committed Rs.1,000 crores to the card project, with half the money coming from the States and the other half from the Centre. Nation-wide, 65 per cent of all cards have been issued so far. Haryana has issued almost 90 per cent of the cards. Maharashtra has achieved 80 per cent and Punjab 75 per cent. Other States have been slower, but even then I am optimistic that the process will reach a conclusion by the end of the year. I should perhaps add that this job is being done not by the Election Commission, but by the State governments.

Within the Election Commission itself, we have set up an extremely sophisticated computer system. How quickly did you get the results during the last Lok Sabha elections? We caught the television channels with their pants down, as they admitted. This was because they did not have an adequate relay of staff to handle the results that were pouring in. You must also have noticed that we had a Website up and running. Results were relayed and Cambridge could instantly study results in Tamil Nadu a fact which brought great credit to this country. This despite the fact that I had only two months to complete the election because Parliament had to meet by the third week of March (for a vote-on-account).

I want to emphasise that these are systems. Men will go away, I will go away, and my colleagues will go away. But these systems will last. Looking back over our half century of Independence, Amartya Sen has argued that if we take stock of our achievements, the holding of free, fair and credible elections in the face of tremendous odds will be at the top of the list. Should we take satisfaction from this achievement, or is it being degraded now?

As they say, eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. The

Election Commission is very much at centre stage in the system of liberty we have. It has to make efforts eternally, to be eternally vigilant, because it is always under challenge. I told the Foreign Minister of Denmark when he discussed this that it was very easy to talk about perfect elections when you had a per capita income of \$20,000. Try even attempting it when you have a per capita income of \$300. India has been doing it. That is an achievement that demands recognition. My word does not constitute a test of fairness, but facts do. In every election, Prime Ministers, Ministers and Members of Parliament are overthrown. We have done a study of 11 past Parliaments and found that the probability of the reelection of a Member of Parliament was just one in four. It can't happen in countries where 99.9 per cent is the popularity of the President.

In a larger sense, democracy in a poor country can never be entirely perfect, because the system is always under challenge. I call the period of Jawaharlal Nehru an imperial democracy. He was a great hero and there was hardly any opposition to him. In fact he was trying to create it. So elections were cool exercises, carried out in an almost casual way. With all respect to my predecessors, and I say this as a civil servant of 40 years' standing, they didn't have to sweat it out. They would have an election and then it was scotch and bridge for the next five years. I am sweating more in this job than I ever did in any of my civil service jobs. We have elections after elections. Our polity is made up, as V.S. Naipaul described it, of a million despots. East and

West, north and south, rich and poor, religion... there are a million concerns. All sub-groups are now standing up, as they indeed should. I support that tremendously as an individual. They want not just a share of the cake, but the whole cake. So the Commission has a terribly onerous duty, and we have to work all the time. That is why I keep appealing to political parties to do their duty. If they have faith in the democratic system, which they must if they are not themselves to be pushed off the cricket pitch one day, then lots of things have to be done. They have to be serious about electoral reforms.

What would be the priorities on this front?

I'll give you one example which I have been speaking about. The Constitution says that Parliament shall make such arrangements as it sees fit for delimitation after each census. India is one of the few proud developing countries that are able to carry out one. Pakistan has not been able to do it; neither has Nigeria. I salute those in India who have carried out the Census, and will do so again in the year 2000.

There are two jobs in delimitation: to increase or decrease the seat entitlement of a State on the basis of its population. The second is to balance the size of constituencies. One concern, which is dear to me as a person concerned with development, is population. Kerala, Tamil Nadu, Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh have done great work in family planning. This is terribly important. While we celebrate 50 years of

Independence, we cannot celebrate the fact that we have made a population of 30 crores into 100 crores in the same period, and that just half of it is literate. These are matters of concern for all Indians. Now, in the 1970s Parliament decided that it would not touch delimitation because, and I agree with this, you cannot reward those who recklessly increase population.

The Election Commission has proposed that while the increase and decrease of representation should continue to be blocked, forever if need be, the second job of balancing constituencies cannot continue to be neglected. Let me explain. Delhi has the Outer Delhi Lok Sabha seat with 28 lakh voters, and Chandni Chowk with less than four lakh voters. Is the worth of a citizen in Outer Delhi villages a sixth of that of one in Chandni Chowk's bazaars? No. There are Outer Delhi and Chandni Chowks in Chennai and Mumbai as well. This is unconstitutional, and someone can challenge it in court. I believe it is the Commission's duty to do something about it, but we don't have the powers. I believe it is Parliament's duty to correct and balance such diversions.

Second, I do not believe it is either necessary or constitutional to have delimitation commissions of retired persons to deal with these issues. The Election Commission of India is the correct body to deal with this. If the Constitution mandates that the Election Commission shall manage and supervise elections, how can it not allow us to ensure that we have constituencies with balanced numbers of voters? This has to be left to the Commis-

*The entry of criminals into politics is something that concerns everybody: the press, the people and even politicians themselves. I will first clarify that it is not a national phenomenon, as the foreign press sometimes represents it to be. It is pockets, but sadly those pockets are like cancer. Like a cancer, these pockets have to be eliminated. Otherwise our polity cannot stand.*

I appeal to Parliament to give the authority to do this within such broad directions as it may see fit, particularly since the Election Commission is now a three-member body like a court. We have asked for it, but if they block or reject the proposal, they will be doing great damage.

Parliament has also been less than enthusiastic about your proposals to remove criminals from the electoral arena.

The entry of criminals into politics is something that concerns everybody: the press, the people and even politicians themselves. I will first clarify that it is not a national phenomenon, as the foreign press sometimes represents it to be. It is pockets, but sadly those pockets are like cancer. Like a cancer, these pockets have to be eliminated. Otherwise our polity cannot stand.

Today, we have Section 8 in the Representation of the People Act, which has a list of offences ranging from sat to vote manipulation to grave crimes. If you are found guilty of having committed any of these, you can be debarred from standing for election and from voting for up to six years. The Commission, I must say, never really focused on this in the past. The view taken was that even if you were found guilty of any of these offences by the court but you went in appeal, you could participate in elections until there was no further redress available to you. This was a mistake, and is not acceptable to this Commission.

proposal falls within that. Your fundamental rights can be checked to a certain extent to preserve the Indian state itself.

Last year, Parliament passed a solemn resolution to put electoral reforms at the top of the agenda. Kindly recall that I appeal to them to pass our proposal quickly and unanimously. Otherwise the cancer will spread. You are not providing the Election Commission, as you are bound by the Constitution to do. You are somehow leaving us to take up arms against a set of misfortunes, and somehow vanquish them.

All parties in Opposition demand the moon from the Commission at election time. But once in Parliament, they do not show the same enthusiasm. We wait with bated breath for them to act.

Another idea political parties seem less than enthusiastic about is your suggestion that Chief Ministers resign before elections are held.

generally takes not one lifetime but two, there are a couple of hundred appeals pending in the High courts and even in the Supreme Court. As Ghalib wrote: I do believe, I do believe, that you will not delay in coming, but I will be ashes before you have dressed your hair in a nice bun!

We read the Supreme Court judgments on the issue and are convinced that the existing system is not correct. If you are convicted for interfering maliciously and criminally with India's democratic structure, you must be blocked from elections. Your appeal and so on are fine, but that is a separate issue. We have begun to apply this thinking. We have even put in an affidavit requirement for all candidates, and I am glad to salute the politicians from successive Prime Ministers downwards who have respected it. This is the strength of Indian democracy, not the greatness of the Election Commission. In Madhya Pradesh, a candidate was barred from standing for election on the basis of his affidavit.

So, what law we have, we are applying. Now we have gone further and made a historic proposition to all parties after grave consideration of the issues at stake. What we are saying is that even the first conviction, especially of a candidate, takes far too long. Our proposition is that if charges are framed against you by a judge or magistrate which could lead to five years' imprisonment, that should be good enough to block. Parliaments and Assemblies are sacred national spaces. While we know you are innocent until proven guilty, the Supreme Court has laid down a doctrine of reasonable restriction. Our

Fundamentally, I believe we have clung to British ideas of how elections should be managed even where they are wholly inappropriate. We do not have a British society, economic system or political culture. If my proposals are accepted, you will find the bureaucracy and the police become impartial, and that 80 per cent of our election-related problems disappear. It is as simple as that.

I am aware of the casual reactions of some of the political parties to my suggestions. To them, I have two things to say. First, I listen with all respect to what they say. I call all-party meetings regularly. I think I am also entitled to the courtesy from the major political parties of at least one response to my proposals, so the country can know why they think what I am suggesting is wrong. Put your arguments on the table. Nobody can have a monopoly on visualising how India ought to be.

You asked me earlier what the three-member Commission's achievements were. I do not believe that independence requires a perpetually sustained hostility with other organs of the state. In fact, I am convinced that the Constitution can only be made to work through constant dialogue between high organs of the state. Dialogue does not detract from anybody's independence. The Election Commission is linked by an umbral cord to the political system, and I have high regard for the entire political spectrum. I do not condemn political parties as the press sometimes tends to. For 70-80 years, political workers of all parties, from the Marxists to the Bharatiya Janata Party, from the Congress to the Akali Dal, have walked the dusty roads of India educating people on our polity. Most of them will never even achieve block-level office. I spare a thought for them.

State funding, I endorse. I have been saying only one thing, that is, we must be careful and cautious. Money that is given must be accounted for. This Commission made history when it said that Doordashan and the media education people of the property of any party but belonged to the people. We first ensured that you might describe as negative fairness. We blocked the broadcast of news slanted in favour of some party or the other at election time.

transform the situation at the State level, where the cutting edge of power is: the Superintendents of Police, the Collectors, and so on. This could be done during both Lok Sabha and Assembly elections. After all, the civil services and the police do not abuse power for the heck of it, but to keep someone in power happy. There is a solution to that. When an election is announced by us, and that is about two months before a five-year term comes to an end, the State government should automatically disappear. This will not really impinge on anybody's five-year term, since the last six months of that term in any case belong to the Election Commission. We can announce elections at any time during that period. There should be Governor's Rule from this time on, allowing the Election Commission to monitor the elections closely through Central nominees. If Governors are not appointed fairly, a composite selection mechanism can be set up, perhaps like that for the Central Vigilance Commission.

Fundamentally, I believe we have clung to British ideas of how elections should be managed even where they are wholly inappropriate. We do not have a British society, economic system or political culture. If my proposals are accepted, you will find the bureaucracy and the police become impartial, and that 80 per cent of our election-related problems disappear. It is as simple as that.

I am aware of the casual reactions of some of the political parties to my suggestions. To them, I have two things to say. First, I listen with all respect to what they say. I call all-party meetings regularly. I think I am also entitled to the courtesy from the major political parties of at least one response to my proposals, so the country can know why they think what I am suggesting is wrong. Put your arguments on the table. Nobody can have a monopoly on visualising how India ought to be.

You asked me earlier what the three-member Commission's achievements were. I do not believe that independence requires a perpetually sustained hostility with other organs of the state. In fact, I am convinced that the Constitution can only be made to work through constant dialogue between high organs of the state. Dialogue does not detract from anybody's independence. The Election Commission is linked by an umbral cord to the political system, and I have high regard for the entire political spectrum. I do not condemn political parties as the press sometimes tends to. For 70-80 years, political workers of all parties, from the Marxists to the Bharatiya Janata Party, from the Congress to the Akali Dal, have walked the dusty roads of India educating people on our polity. Most of them will never even achieve block-level office. I spare a thought for them.

State funding, I endorse. I have been saying only one thing, that is, we must be careful and cautious. Money that is given must be accounted for. This Commission made history when it said that Doordashan and the media education people of the property of any party but belonged to the people. We first ensured that you might describe as negative fairness. We blocked the broadcast of news slanted in favour of some party or the other at election time.