A few months back, Anna Hazare, in reply to a question that whether he would join politics, replied in the negative. On being asked why, he said that he would never win. He does not have neither the money nor the inclination to bribe voters, get them liquor or feasts—things he considers very vital to win an election. Anna Hazare is a well-known social activist. His integrity, his commitment towards the nation, is beyond doubt. But such statements from him perplexed many—believers of the democratic system who effectively aid win elections.
by bribing voters, what good can we expect from them? How can they represent us? Anna's movement against corruption was often perceived as a people's uprising against the "taxation" of the parliament—the coming together of people war of people on parliament. Statements were made denouncing the composition of people on the parliament as also the M.P.'s themselves. The parliament was seen as a den of the corrupt, an anti-people institution.

But isn't parliament about the symbol of democracy? Is it not the voice of the people, the expression of the aspirations of the people? Are not M.P.'s our representatives? Then how come this people vs parliament phenomenon?

To put things in perspective, parliament to always had its critics. The extreme left
considers it to be a sham—a tool of the bourgeoisie to exploit the masses—
a smoke screen to gratify the lust of the rich under the guise of being the representative of the masses. Lenin called it a big stage. The Narodniks endorse this position. Bismarck considered parliament a tool futile talking shop. Never, he said, can effective decisions be taken by discussions. Democracy, for him, was patriotic. Yeast of South German anarchism was too easy with the idea of the parliament. He considered to be a foreign idea. True freedom can't be achieved by parliament. It can come only when each man conquers himself; is his own master.

Be it so, this is what we had fought for—democracy. This was the overwhelming consensus among the leaders of the national movement. It seems...
to be the consensus even now, and it is for good reasons.

So vast, so heterogeneous a country like India can't but be ruled by a representative institution. We have the barriers of geography, of caste, the barriers of religion, of class, of what not. Even the most well meaning of rulers can't understand the full magnitude of these problems, in their all their facets without the help of a representative institution. Of course we don't & can't have democracy in its Aristotelian form — direct democracy. The country is too huge for that. Also the problems too complex.

For all to dwell on them. So we have the next best thing — representative democracy. One man can't represent all. However, we are always trying to get a constant devolution of power, by Panchayati.
Raj institutions etc. Election reforms also take place (like lowering voting age or declaring wealth). Too put things in context, we also have our own share of problems—bags full of them. We have the problems of poverty, of corruption, of black money, of inefficient delivery mechanism, of M.P.'s who double up as criminals, of too powerful who can't be brought to book, of the ever-expanding population, of the polluted rivers etc. We have problems galore & this irritates us. May not always are M.P.'s representing us. We are a young country. We want to grow fast. Such things seen to be putting shackles on our feet. Neighbouring China on the other hand seems all so efficient, & this increases our anxiety. Our parliament seems not working the most efficiently. In fact, some of them are corrupt, some with criminal records. They seem to be oblivious to our needs. 
as much as we would have liked it to), a once ext people have come out of the narrow & dark ghetos of caste & religion, ready to take on the world. A once shamelessly exploited colony is now on its path to become what could be a “super power”.

True, our parliament is a little shaky than the oft cited Chinese polit bureau. But then, this was what we “knew” knowingly asked for. It has its own advantages. For e.g. the Draulian’s movement could be see. quelled down without firing a bullet just because we were soft & accommodative at the top. To cite another example—that of the population monster. China has of the population monster (coercive) tamed it, thanks to deceptive government steps. India couldn’t for fear of electoral backlash to a coercive govern-
as much as we would have liked it to, once and for all people have come out of the narrow & dark ghettos of caste & religion, ready to take on the world. A once shamelessly exploited colony is now on its path to become what could be a "super power".

True, our parliament is a little shaky than the oft-cited Chinese "bureaucracy". But then, this was what we "knew": knowingly opted for. It has its own advantages. For e.g. the Dravidian movement could be quelled down without firing a bullet just because we were soft & accommodative at the top. To cite another example, that of the population monster: China has of the population monster. (coercive) government tamed it, thanks to coercive government steps. India couldn't do it for fear of electoral backlash to a coercive government.
In the long run however it seems India is the net gainer. The fallout of the coercive policies it seems will hurt China a lot. Thus her "window of demographic dividend" will close a lot too soon. Thus China will grey before getting rich.

India, allowing nature to face no such predicament. Yet she also had no such problem. Her population growth (though not as fast as China) & she did it by co-opting her people. Electoral pressures had forced her people to find better ways out.

Yes, in the short term we are a lot more shaky (we here means the parliament, but then ours is a sustainable path) but then ours is a sustainable path. The ex USSR was also, on the surface. The ex USSR was also, on the surface. But then it was not quiet efficient, but then it was not sustainable.

Again, to put things in perspective, all such shakiness, for good or bad, is because parliament has to cater to the people's wish.
Things True dissillation has crept in. Movements denying parliament & M.P's gain a lot of sympathy. But once one sees cares to see the whole picture he can see that things are improving, & improving fast. May be not as fast as the expectations of people are rising, but fast. And it's all due to the deliberative parliament — sometimes slow, but sure.

In fact corruption, the issue about which Anna's movement is all about couldn't be hidden thanks to this very parliament. It is this very parliament that made crushing every popular movement impossible. No wonder Anna, to clear things up, said that he does not wish in any way to enroach upon the parliament. In fact his next move would be to persuade
people to send better representatives to parliament. May be election reforms are needed, but again that has to be decided by the parliament. For it is the parliament that embodies the wish of the country.

[N.B.: Dear Sir, please send the comments by email rajpatrick25may@gmail.com]