



---

## Monopolization of Democracy – Special Reference to Indian Context

**Dr. Krishna Roy**

Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, Shirakole Mahavidyalaya, Shirakole, South 24  
Parganas (West Bengal), Pin: - 743513

---

**DOI : <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18229626>**

---

### ARTICLE DETAILS

**Research Paper**

**Accepted:** 20-12-2025

**Published:** 10-01-2026

**Keywords:**

*Monopolization,  
Democracy, India, Political  
Diversity, Accountability,  
Government, Manipulation.*

---

### ABSTRACT

Monopolization in India's democracy manifests as concentrated political power in a single party, increased corporate influence (crony capitalism) shaping policy, erosion of democratic institutions (judiciary, media, labor), and diminishing political diversity, all leading to concerns about governance skewed towards elites, reduced accountability, and threats to socio-economic rights for the masses, challenging the nation's pluralistic democratic foundations. Key areas are :- a) Political Power Concentration:- A single party (BJP) gaining strong majorities, leading to potential centralization of power and reduced need for broad coalition consensus, Concerns about the erosion of checks and balances, with critics pointing to actions like mass MP suspensions as symptoms of power monopolization. b) Economic Influence & Crony Capitalism:- Close ties between large businesses and ruling parties lead to policies favoring elites, creating "oligarchizing" where wealth dictates power, Actions like the dismantling of MGNREGA and weakening labor codes are seen as facilitating wealth concentration by benefiting crony capitalists, notes Madras Courier. c) Erosion of Institutions & Pluralism:- Media: Big money stifles the free press, reducing diverse viewpoints crucial for democracy, Labor: Dilution of labor laws weakens unions, making workers vulnerable and increasing the pool of cheap labor, benefiting corporate interests, Political Diversity: Charismatic leadership and



populist schemes (like gas cylinder price cuts) can mask policy disharmony and diminish the space for alternative political identities,

d) Patronage & Accountability:- A shift towards "patronage democracy" where state access (jobs, services) is monopolized, influencing voting patterns (e.g., voting for co-ethnics), This system can distort fair competition, making political power inaccessible to ordinary citizens and increasing non-transparent resource monopolization. Underlying themes are:- Fusion of Power: Economic and political power increasingly merge, skewing governance towards the wealthy, Disempowerment: Erosion of social safety nets (like MGNREGA) and labor rights disproportionately affects the rural and informal workforce, notes Madras Courier, Voter Manipulation: Use of direct benefits and charismatic leadership to solidify loyalty, potentially overshadowing deeper policy issues. In essence, "monopolization" describes a trend where power, wealth, and political control converge, challenging India's traditional pluralistic democracy by creating a system where a few powerful entities (government/corporates) dominates

---

## **I. Introduction**

Democracy, in its contextual and conceptual aspects, is filled with a bundle of contradictions. With the introduction of neo economic globalization, the contradictions began to appear very vividly. Indian democracy is increasingly becoming undemocratic and centralized in every respect. This is an enquiry into the impact of neo liberal global capitalism on the re-establishment of monarchies and feudalisms through democratic process. In this article we will analyze the concept of democracy, nature of democracy in Asian countries with special reference to Nehruvian concept and the monopolization of democracy in Indian society.

## **II. Concept of Democracy**

The modern democracy which was an offshoot of capitalism, in principle, stands against capitalism. In the modern Europe, a few among the middle class became rich by amassing wealth through the improvement of mercantile activities. Many of them, then, invested their surplus wealth in the



mechanization of manufacturing sector that in turn brought back abundance of treasures to them. They were called capitalists who produced or exchanged commodities for the sake of accumulation of profit. They began to show their presence not only in the economic sphere but in the social and political domains as well. Marx and Engels recognized the historical importance of the bourgeois class. According to them it was the most revolutionary class in the history of Europe. It was the most vibrant and dynamic class which history had ever seen. The bourgeois army demolished feudal rigidity, religious hypocrisy and family sentiments. “It has been the first to show what man’s activity can bring out. It has accomplished wonders far surpassing Egyptian pyramids, Roman aqueducts and Gothic Cathedrals, it has conducted expeditions that put in the shade all former exoduses of nations and crusades” (Marx and Engels: 1848: 38). In the process of the bourgeois uprising all the controls of feudalism were broken.

The monarchs of that time who were impoverished due to repeated wars had been going on imposing more and more tax on the newly emerged rich to overcome the financial crisis and to meet the war expenses. It disturbed the capitalists and resisted the unilateral imposition of taxes. As a compromise, many European monarchs accepted capitalists demand to consult them before charging with extra tax. A lower house of the parliament (House of Commons) as against the House of Lords was established to consult the tax payers. The newly formed consultative body was called the lower house because the members were the representatives of non-aristocrats.

The dominance has the tendency to convert the consultative body into a place for passing information. If the consultative body asserts its role, conflict arises. Whenever the monarch was willing to hear the representatives of the tax payers, the consultative body continued to exist. At times consultation ended in the clash of interests which sometimes resulted in revolution.

The English Revolution limited the powers of the monarchy. Parliament was made a necessary consultative body. People’s representatives began to administer as members of the executive. Above all, the English Revolution defined the principles of liberalism. It assured security to the life and property of the individuals. The social revolution was another offshoot of the political revolution.

English democracy contradicted itself from the beginning. Though democracy was the result of the demand by the capitalists to devolve power, once capitalists gained accession to the power, they found ways to deny it to the working class. Gainers of freedom obstructed the spread of it. The greatest problem of distribution is the fear of loss. The classes that have accessed facilities with upper class see that no other group competes with them to share what they have gained. The English liberal democrats stood



against democratic principles to retain aristocracy for them. It was only a tax payer's democracy. The lower class had to continue their struggle for universal suffrage for a few more centuries.

The spirit of capitalism in accumulation. On the contrary the spirit of democracy is devolution. How can capitalism promote democracy? It is a contradiction in the very spirit of both. How can a moneyed class work for an egalitarian democracy? "In a modern meaning of democracy, several aspects must be kept in mind as the goal and means of day to day policies. One relates to economic rights and power, another political participation and the power of execution and a third is the use of communications, inquiry and knowledge to define clearly the natural right that people have a result of their being human. Unfortunately, the modern definition of politics and of democracy – is limited to concern with the distribution of power and resources" (Raskin: 1986: 276). The unequal distribution of equal opportunity makes an unequal society. Socio-political and economic disadvantage of the majority on the sidelines of a well facilitated dominant minority can create only lopsided democracy. Power empowers the members of the ruling class, the more power they achieve the less distributed. The present form of democracy provides thousand ways to monopolize political power and to concentrate wealth in the hands of a few. Democracy is high jacked by the new lords of democracy is high jacked by the new lords of democracy against the interest of the majority.

A core value of bourgeois philosophy is humanism, recognizing every human being as an end in himself. But on the process, the great bourgeois values which have moved the world such as freedom, equality and fraternity are chocked.

The bourgeois concept of freedom in its humanistic sense was an assertion on human ability of being one's own master. Thus the capitalist philosophy reiterated human dignity. In the political context, the human dignity and worth were expressed by extolling the concept of liberty. If human being was able to guide and make himself, one should not be prevented from planning and doing things by oneself. They demanded less intervention by the state in individual affairs, as external intervention curtailed self-expression and self-realization. For them, freedom improved the efficiency of the individuals. The bourgeois philosophy argued for leaving the individuals free for natural selection, so that the fittest ones survived. Hence, there was no need for any artificial control over the individuals by the state. Unfortunately, all are not facilitated with the power to enjoy freedom. But, "freedom of enterprise was from the beginning not altogether a blessing. As the liberty to work or to starve, it spelled toil, insecurity and fear for the vast majority of the population" (Raskin: 1986:276). If the survival is decided by the



warring situations, unequal, oppressive relations only are possible. In such a situation it is absurd to speak about fraternity.

### **III. Nature of Democracy in Asian Countries Mainly Nehru's Concept**

Looking back at the crowded panorama of this century, the one thought that readily comes to mind is the abiding radiance of Nehru's image while concentrating on Indian democracy. He was a nation builder and the whole network of democratic institutions in the country, which we now take for granted, was nurtured by Nehru. To Nehru, democracy did not merely mean periodical exercise of franchise. The democratic spirit must inform the whole web of relationship between the citizens and the state and among citizens themselves. After independence, Nehru criticized the governance and the political thought of this Asian democrat differed largely from other scholars of the time.

According to him, democracy was an extension of the democratic principle to the economic domain. Nehru stood for progress, for modernization and for the onward march of India towards a just and egalitarian order (Jalal Ayesha: 1995:20-26). To ensure political equality, Nehru argued that it is obvious to achieve economic prosperity, and people should have equality of opportunity and they should be able to go as they can go (Chakroborty Bidyut: 1993:146-48).

Hence in this context we should mention that Nehruvian democracy opt the model of unique democratic traits which is distinct from other South Asian countries.

The newly liberated countries of Asia have made a willing choice of democratic constitutions and practices. However most of the Asian countries have adopted democratic forms with slight modifications. The Asian countries have to work in the background of poverty and illiteracy, of multi-racial societies and of communities following many religions. The challenge of communism therefore has become a real challenge to these countries. Because of the threat of communism, there has been a sense of urgency in solving the problems facing these countries and a tendency to give up some of the democratic values. In spite of economically underdeveloped, communism has not been successful in undermining democratic institutions and ideals and thus democratic ideals have inspired the people of Asia. But there are several problems (World Brotherhood: 1960:62-63) to work democracy successfully in Asian context.

1. Masses of people in these countries are illiterate and ignorant. Thus people are attracted to the personalities and to the regional and linguistic groups and fractions and not so much loyal to the political parties.



2. Leaders mostly become self-seeking, satisfying their own personal ambitions and retaining power rather than helping the common people.
3. Masses are then gradually alienated from the government mainly because of concentration of power at higher levels.
4. In all Asian countries, corruption in administration has been so rampant that it has almost corroded the body politic of the countries concerned.
5. Politics is the art of getting money from the rich and votes from the poor, on the pretext of protecting the one from the other.

Irrespective of these difficulties for working of democratic government there is way out to strengthen democracy -

1. To educate the masses in the ways of freedom by spreading the spirit and ideals of democracy and to create a democratic community and
2. To introduce the method of universal adult franchise.

Democracy as a political institution and as a way of life is essential in the affairs of man. It not only meant a representative form of government, but its inherent attributes of different freedoms such as freedom of thought and speech, freedom of religion, freedom of association and to eliminate inequality and poverty. But in almost all Asian countries faced the problem of rapid population growth, gender inequality, and lack of constructive methods in economic sphere, lack of conscious public opinion, poverty, and lack of resources, unemployment and in diversified economies. The democratic institutions in other South Asian countries like Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nepal, and Bhutan, Srilanka loose the true spirit of democratic ideals. Due to population explosion in these countries, they adopt new decentralized policies like- privatization-participation lead to the erosion of traditional forms of sovereign political control by the nation-state and the trans-nationalization of economic activity result in the political centrality of the state for example- Nepal. Many are governed by a variety of urban regimes that are more or less un-democratic. Many of them witnessed military coups and takeovers, dissolution of parliaments, abrogation of democratic constitutions, banning of political parties, giving rise in the process of turmoil bordering on civil wars, for example- military rule in Pakistan or authoritarian monarchy in Nepal or civil rights violations in Bangladesh and absence of public opinion which are not at all the traits of democracy (Jalal Ayesha: 1995:72-73).



In this respect, Nehru's success in keeping the democratic institution intact and in defending the democratic way of life remain un-matched with other countries of South Asia. The success of democracy in India will have a great impact on the rest of Asian and Africa. It is our duty not only to the people of India, but to Asia and Africa and the rest of humanity to make this system an effective one, which embodies all the freedoms and the moral and ethical values which we cherish and succeed. Indian democracy is marked by strong ruling party with the presence of public participation in political affairs, freedom of choice and expression, representative government that provide suitable environment to develop public opinion which really make democracy to survive and work successfully.

#### **IV. Monopolization of Democracy with Special Reference to Indian Context**

Democracy, under neo-liberal global capitalism, shows the symptoms of all the dichotomies of capitalist democracy of its earlier days which was against welfare regulations. The present day democracy brought back the link between property and democracy. It is reestablished to the advantage of the wealthy. "Voting was the way in which one represented his or her property. But once property and voting separated a new theory was formulated. The vote would obtain the property and capital that was so crucial for dignity of the person and the group. Alternatively, government would act as the interlocutor with the rich" (Raskin: 1986:276). There are many reasons by which the government of the people estranges itself from the ordinary majority and joins hands with the rich.

The primary reason is the expensive democratic process. Though the election expenses by a candidate of Parliamentary Constituency in India, that varies from state to state is fixed from 10,00,000 to the maximum of 25,00,000, it is a well-known fact that many candidates spend much above the approved amount. No official document is possible regarding it, because publicizing the surplus spending may trap a candidate for violating the code conduct of general election. We can have an example from the recent presidential election in America where things are bit more open than ours. President Barrack Obama, after being chosen as the presidential nominee of the Democrats, asked his finance team to help Senator Hillary Clinton pay off her debt of at least \$10 million from her failed presidential campaign, setting the stage for joint appearance for the presidential campaign for Obama (The Statesman:26th June:2008). Election fund raisers, whether in America or in India, have to approach the rich for donations. Political donation is a bribe paid in advance. Thus people's representatives are increasingly becoming representatives of industrialists and rich merchants. Most of the election expenses by the parties is unaccounted money. Source and purpose of donation are clearly revealed to the leaders and concealed from the public. Political donations determine the hidden manifesto of the political parties. With the



implementation of neo liberal economy, external agencies pump money to the parties to execute their will in our nation through our leaders. Therefore democracy becomes pseudo government functions for the donors and leaders keep away from people.

NEW, an organization of more than 1,200 NGOs working on electoral reforms, improving democracy and governance in India, found in one of their recent studies that among the major parties the average asset per BSP candidate is Rs. 130 million, the Congress Rs. 60 million and the BJP Rs. 20 million. This shows that the democracy is a rich man's affair (ibid). Can a poor country like India afford a very costly democracy? That forces us to think of cost effective and peoples friendly democracy.

It is very costly affair to run the political parties as well. Earlier political parties were of the people. People spent on the functioning of the party. Now parties are of the leaders. Therefore the leaders have to spend on every day activities of parties. People have a strong impression that the leaders accumulate wealth by using their position. If people think that the leaders have to invest for their gain who are to be blamed. As a result, individual leaders are forced to involve in the corrupt practices. Most dangerous sign of this thinking is visible during the time of election. Many are inclined to sell their suffrage instead of using property. They consider the election time as the right opportunity to bargain their share of corruption than demanding their rights.

Neo-liberal global capitalism paved the way for the faster estrangement of democratic institutions and values from society. The course and pattern of investment and economic development have been changed with the new economic policy. We received huge amount from funding agencies like the World Bank, IMF and Asian Development Bank. Now a day, the governments are trying to please the multinationals to the extent of displeasing their own voters. The more our planners depend on the external funding agencies and foreign investors the more they oblige to satisfy the interests of them. They neglect common people and common good. The administrations function for the groups who fund parties. They design developmental programmes that are beneficial to them and their sponsors. Thus our leaders fail to represent our will. "Between us and our rulers there lies a vast abyss which is filled by the devices that power and its varied mechanisms bring into being. We are told that public opinion wills this and desires the other. But we have no satisfying channels either for garnering of public opinion or for placing before it the materials upon which it may build an edifice of demand which represents its wants" (Laski:1984:241). Even if the people try to gather their opinion, administrative mechanism is powerful enough to suppress such voices in the beginning itself. The inflow of money from different sources strengthened the powerful and they are now capable to sideline or manipulate public voice. External



funding causes negligence of the strength of what is internal. Funding raises a few among people different and separates them from the ordinary and makes them capable to exploit others. The administrators, including political representatives, started to acquire a part of the fund by fair or foul means.

At the time of democratic revolutions the bourgeoisie achieved share in power. And now, during the mature days of democracy, the democratic leaders obtain easy access to people's wealth. The political leaders who streamline the entrepreneurs are becoming great entrepreneurs. They converted democracy to their favor and monopolized power and wealth and added social status as well. They systematized unconditional obedience from party cadres, veneration from followers and approval from general public to promote rulers' interest as if the interest of the public (Terry Eagleton:2002: 121).

Capitalism, as a system, is incapable of pursuing the values of the bourgeois philosophy including democratic values, because the inner force that moves it is selfish and competitive in nature. Each capitalist has to compete with every other capitalist for his survival. In the same way, in a democracy, each politician has to fight for survival. Each one aims at power to serve but achieves it through any foul means. There is so much competition among politicians, one against another, that they are compelled to do as politicians that they are otherwise ashamed of doing. A system that demands anti-national activities for serving the nation and its citizens is more of a systemic self-contradiction than lack of individual integrity. In the present political climate no democratic leader can voluntarily give up his ruthless pursuit of power. It is not because of the personal greediness that is demanded by the system. If one is not following the entire above activities one sees one's own retirement from politics very soon. Terry Eagleton observes systemic self-contradictions in the neo-liberal world thus, "it is not accidental that this profoundly disenchanted discovery of the collusion between law and desire should be the intellectual achievement of a form of civilization in which unbridled appetite is the very order of the day. Whichever way round we view the deadlock, we must come to terms with the fact that fantasy, desire and disruption are in some sense actually part of the given order" (Raskin:1986:275).

The political executive in a modern democracy (Kohli: 2001:15-19) has a right and responsibility to formulate complex regulatory economic frameworks, on the basis of which diverse commercial and industrial groups are expected to conduct and manage their businesses. It is easy to maintain that private business will be conducted on the basis of the rules of the game decided by democratically elected political representatives.



The reality is that businessmen perceive their own interests that are many a time, at variance with the legal structure laid down by elected representatives. Powerful business groups make every effort to win over the public policy makers for the protection and promotion of their own business interests. If politics wants to control and regulate economic activity with a view to promote public good, business too wants to influence and control the government in every democracy for its own personal advantage. Hence, every modern democracy has engaged itself in evolving mechanisms to keep political decision makers insulated from the attempts of businessmen to influence the making of public policies.

Prime Minister Manmohan Singh is seized of the problem of keeping politics at a distance from business and on 3rd February, the media reported that the ministers have been asked to sever all ties with business in which they have a stake. The PM (The Statesman:26th June:2008) rightly felt that there is a likely conflict of interest if ministers are associated with business and hence they are advised to distance themselves from the conduct of any business they might have been interested in before appointment. But according to PM politicians in power should get trusts to handle their business interests. The story of inter-relationship and illicit liaison between politics and business does not end with ministers managing their own business or the possibility of inter-penetration of politics and business on the basis of funds provided by businessmen for elections to political parties or individual influential political leaders. Every democratic country including India has laws for the regulation of corporate funding of elections.

And if Indira Gandhi, in her wisdom, thought that parties will not collect funds from businessmen for elections simply by imposing a legal ban, the US Supreme Court on January 22nd, in a five versus four judgments, has stated that the government may not ban political spending by corporations in candidate elections. Hence funds for elections are not the only mechanism available to the big business. Highly professional lobbyists are appointed by businessmen and are seen in the corridors of government power for the relationships with politicians and bureaucracy for mutual benefit and support.

Further powerful associations of businessmen such as Ficci, CII and ASSOCHAM have played active role in establishing links with public policy makers. Associations of industry have institutionalized the principle of reciprocity and mutuality between business and politics. It is difficult to quantify the influence that business exercises in the government's economic decision-making processes. It can be safely summarized that business and industry have created enough space to promote their economic interests by winning over politicians to their viewpoint.

However, it is not such a neat operation because political parties, groups and factional leaders require huge resources not only to contest elections but also to manage organizations. The supreme leaders of all-



India, regional or sub-regional parties maintain a tight control over their followers because finances are collected and disbursed only by the party bosses. Parties become a personal family affair because financial resources have to be guarded by trusted people. Thus dynasty politics has become a norm rather than an exception. Private fund givers also prefer to deal with a single centre of power in a party so centralization of political fund collection has been facilitated by businessmen.

This system of centralized collection of funds from businessmen (Hasan Zoya: 1999:26-32) was created by Indira Gandhi, She had realized, on the basis of her own bitter struggle for power within the party, that the leader's supremacy is accepted only if funds are controlled at the top of a party's power pyramid. Public funding of elections can marginally reduce the dependence of politicians on the funds provided by industry and business. However the emergence of coalition politics in which minister representing a partner collects funds only for his party has complicated the equation. Thus the relationship between politics and business has undergone big changes because under the coalition system of governance, businesses have no work under many political masters and every political group is autonomously engaged in dealing with sections of industry and business.

The story does not end here. A sea change has taken place in the role of state governments in economic policy formulation. From the beginning of 1990s, the relationship between political decision makers and economic actors (Kothari Rajni: 1995: 344-47) has become quite crucial and critical. Every state is competing for investment and investors are competing against one another in every state for development for development projects. This competition at the state level has added new rules of the game of negotiations between politicians and businessmen. An apprehension exists that the big business has immense capacity to influence state governments as compared to their clout with the central government.

It is clear therefore, that business and industry are actively engaged in dealing with economic policymakers such as minister's parties, state governments or cash-for-queries by members of Parliament on behalf of interested businessmen. The relative autonomy of politics while dealing with business has been weakened because many formal and informal linkages have developed by these two separate 'centers of power'.

Narendra Modi's alignment with Digital India Reliance Jio (RIL's Telecom) industry as subsidiary and JIO's investment in Indian market of rupees 250,000 crores in government sector in various projects undermine government's power in decision making process. JIO pledged to lay out a next generation wireless network across all Indian states create a nationwide cellular distribution network involving



150,000 retailers, encourage phone manufacturers to set up shop in the country and help small start-up and Digital India will create employment for over 5 lakhs people. Digital India is an amalgamation of various projects aimed at increasing connectivity in the country. Promoted by government officials as an attempt to bridge the divide between digital haves and have-nots, the initiative has been pitched as an ambitious modernizing measure an attempt at “digital empowerment of citizens”. (Times of India, 1st March 2017). JIO claimed that 50 million Indians gained internet access between December 2016 and December, 2017. JIO’s transformative social power proves today India is the fastest digitizing economy in the whole world – JIO is leading India’s digital transformation and JIO will democratize the digital culture in India. But in this process TRAI (Telecom Regulatory Authority of India) have allowed the company to sail towards the top. While TRAI impose regulations on other mobile companies, government favored RIL JIO in expanding the market. JIO’s data pricing have forced competitors (other telecom companies) to slash their tariffs which resulted in rising levels of corporate debt. TRAI have allowed JIO (Hindustan Times, 22nd November, 2018) to sail towards the top and has undermined the health of its competitors by offering prices that may be called predatory, despite laws meant to monitor and restrict anti-competitive activities. TRAI engaged in monopolistic behavior which did not allow other telecom companies to upgrade their mobility license whereas provide the same license to JIO. This governmental step leads to corporate debt of telecommunication companies including Bharat Sanchar Nigam of worth Rs 180,000 crores. Government’s decision of alignment with Reliance telecom for the mission of Digital India formally leads to financial stress of Domestic banks and equipment vendors which shows slash in economic growth of the country. Hence it proves that investment by Reliance group in government sector influences governmental decision and hampers democratic spirit of the country.

In recent time it is noted that the threat of digital platforms today lies in their ability to influence people’s behavior on a large scale and therefore the election process which pose a threat to Indian Democracy. With the electoral bonds, Modi government has also allowed big business to make unlimited and anonymous contributions to political parties making corruption officially legal. Government is also using the digital platforms such as Google, Facebook and Twitter to Indian democracy which has tremendous capacity to influence people’s behavior. These digital platforms ([www.newsclick.in](http://www.newsclick.in), 5th April, 2019) lie outside the existing regulatory framework both in terms of newspaper and television broadcast regulations as well as electoral regulations. The threat of digital platforms today lies in their ability to influence people’s behavior on a large scale; they manipulate people’s feeds that are what they see on their Facebook pages and on Google search. Google’s autosuggestion and auto complete are also subtle weapons in influencing the user and directing them to what Google wants them to see. A swing of 20%



among undecided voters or 4-5% overall swing may appear to be a minor shift but can create a landslide victory for a political party in the first or post system of Indian elections. Therefore the party with money power and no bar on its spending can influence the voter significantly using the digital platforms. They raised the issue of fake news through various Whsts App group (projecting communal violence by BJP IT cell), project fake images of Muzzaffar Nagar riots in 2013 and resulting communal polarization in western Uttar Pradesh before 2014 elections or projecting BJP's Hindutva ideology. The algorithms of Google and Facebook will determine what material will be seen by users on these sites. Silicon Valley tycoons have posed themselves as modern messiahs claiming that they and their technology will build up a modern and a more inclusive society. Hence these social sites help in propagating fake news.

The movements for social change do not have money; they substitute people for money, marches, mobilization of volunteers, door to door campaigning and struggles big or small. The movements may believe that a similar exercise will succeed in the digital space. Here, they come up against not only money but the power of money multiplied by algorithms. The algorithms coupled with our data on the digital platform, do not just multiply the message, but also do what is called targeted advertising. They know which sections of people are susceptible to what message and therefore can micro target different sections of people with different messaging. This is how opinions can be shifted. The digital platforms know where we live, what exactly do we read, what our interests are, our age, sex, caste, religion and other identifiers. These are important in dicing up users of such platforms into small slices of people who would be receptive to a certain kind of messaging. Given that our data lies in computer data bases of the digital platforms like Google and Face book, it is easy using algorithms to extract the kind of demographics required for selling a particular kind of product (www.newsclik.in12th April, 2019).

## V. Conclusion

In essence, democracy is egalitarian. But democratic process is not equally available to its participants. Democracy, in practice paves way for superiority and elitism. Therefore democracy fails. Democracy should be linked with the economic equity. The purpose of democracy is not to protect buy to make everybody the owners of property or in other words contributions of society. The modern democracy constantly evolves and therefore is not a historical. Teachers, leaders and organizers have an obligation to explain to people that rights and obligations are not given but are won through past struggles. We should enter into constructive criticism with suggestions workable models of effective democracy. A political value is to be measured in terms of its ability to safeguard the common interest against the interest of the few. Such value would be successful when the promoters' value gets no special advantage in promoting



them. Democratic value is to be promoted not by individuals but by a structured process. This is possible only by a transparent and accountable process which is simple in approach. Our constitution guarantees a socialist republic which preserves the common good above any individual interest. Therefore in a country like India the flaw is not in the constitution but in the implementation. Unfortunately in India the legislature always think of strict laws to rectify the flaw but they are not ready to strengthen the process of implementation of those laws. In a democracy, we believe that we are independent citizen with our very specific views. We do not think of ourselves as parts of demographics that can influenced by targeted advertisements. But if people can be convinced to buy products based on advertising – and advertising industry is big business for this reason – why should we think politics is different? This is what the digital media platforms have discovered – political advertising is big business and they can sell any other goods. That it works is not surprising after all digital platforms like Google and Face book are among the world’s biggest monopolies today precisely because this advertising model works. It is money power, plain and simple that has seen the enormous growth of political campaigning on social media. It is not about the social media but about the controlling of power of money in the elections. We need to combat today the money power of big capital, exercised by its favorite party, the BJP, combined with the enormous power of digital monopolies to shift people’s opinions. At stake is our democracy. This is what we need to protect democracy in India.

## References

- *Books*
- Chakroborty Bidyut, 1993, Wither India’s Democracy, New Delhi, K.P Bagchi and Company
- Harold. J. Laski, 1984, A Grammar of Politics, New Delhi, S Chand and Company Pub.
- Hasan Zoya ed. 2000, Transforming India, Social and Political Dynamics of Democracy, New Delhi, Oxford University Press Pub.
- Herbert Marcuse, 1964, One Dimensional Man, Boston, Beacon Press Pub.
- Jalal Ayesha, 1995, Democracy and Authoritarianism in South Asia, A comparative and Historical Perspective, New Delhi, Cambridge University Press
- Karl Marx and Federick Engels, 1848, Manifesto of the Communist Party, Selected Works,
- Kohli Atul, 2001, The Success of India’s Democracy, New Delhi, Cambridge University Press Pub.
- Kothari Rajni, 1995, Politics in India, Delhi, Orient Longman Ltd.



- Marcus. G. Ruskin, 1986, The Common Good: Its Politics, Policy and Philosophy, New York, Routledge and Krgaan Paul Pub.
- World Brotherhood All India Committee, 1960, Indian Democracy in the Asian Background, New Delhi, Allied Publishers Private Ltd

### *Journals*

- Terry Eagleton, Capitalism and Form, New Left Review, No.14, March-April, 2002

### *News Paper*

- Times of India, 1st March 2017
- Hindustan Times, 22nd November, 2018
- The Statesman, 26th June.2008

### *Website*

- [www.newsclick.in](http://www.newsclick.in)
- [www.economicstimes.com](http://www.economicstimes.com)