THE ADVERSE EFFECTS OF THE ONE NATION, ONE ELECTION POLICY ON INDIAN DEMOCRACY: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS

*Narwade Mukesh Ramesh

Research Scholar, Department of Political Science, Peoples College, Nanded. Affiliated by SRTM University, Nanded. (M.S). India.

ABSTRACT:

The proposed One Nation, One Election policy seeks to synchronize elections for the Lok Sabha and State Legislative Assemblies to streamline governance and reduce election-related costs. While proponents argue that it enhances administrative efficiency and curbs electoral disruptions, this paper critically examines its adverse effects on Indian democracy. The policy risks undermining federalism by diminishing the autonomy of state governments, leading to a centralization of power. Additionally, it may weaken electoral accountability, as simultaneous elections could reduce the frequency of voter engagement with governance issues. The disproportionate advantage to national parties over regional ones may further erode political diversity, disrupting India's multiparty system. Through a detailed analysis of constitutional, political, and logistical challenges, this study highlights the policy's potential to weaken democratic decentralization and electoral fairness. The paper concludes that while electoral reforms are necessary, a One Nation, One Election framework may pose significant risks to India's democratic fabric.

KEYWORDS: One Nation, One Election, Indian Democracy, Federalism, Political Centralization, Multiparty System, Regional Parties, Etc.

INTRODUCTION:

The concept of One Nation, One Election (ONOE) has emerged as a significant electoral reform proposal in India, advocating for the synchronization of Lok Sabha and State Legislative Assembly elections. Proponents argue that this policy will reduce election expenditure, minimize governance disruptions, and enhance administrative efficiency.

However, a closer examination reveals that this reform could have severe implications for India's democratic framework.

India's democracy is built on the principles of federalism, political plurality, and electoral accountability. The current system of staggered elections ensures continuous political engagement, allowing voters to evaluate governance at regular intervals. The ONOE policy, by contrast, threatens to centralize power, reduce state autonomy, and weaken regional parties, thereby altering the democratic landscape. Furthermore, the logistical and constitutional challenges of implementing simultaneous elections raise concerns about its feasibility and long-term consequences.

This paper critically analyzes the adverse effects of the ONOE policy on Indian democracy, with a particular focus on its impact on federalism, electoral accountability, and political diversity. Through a detailed examination of constitutional provisions, political dynamics, and historical precedents, this study highlights why enforcing a uniform electoral cycle could weaken the democratic fabric of the nation.

Review of Literature:

The One Nation, One Election (ONOE) policy, which proposes simultaneous elections for the Lok Sabha and State Legislative Assemblies, has generated significant debate among scholars, political analysts, and constitutional experts. While proponents argue that it improves governance and reduces election-related expenditure, critics highlight its potential threats to federalism, regional representation, electoral accountability, and constitutional integrity.

1. Federalism and Regional Representation:

India's democratic system is based on a strong federal structure, allowing states to exercise autonomy in governance. Scholars like Mehta (2017) asserts that staggered elections ensure that regional voices are continuously heard, whereas a single election cycle could lead to the dominance of national parties, reducing the influence of state-based concerns.

2. Electoral Autonomy and Democratic Accountability:

Frequent elections allow citizens to hold governments accountable at regular intervals. According to Yadav (2019) argues that ONOE could lead to the "nationalization" of electoral issues, sidelining state-specific problems and weakening democratic engagement.

3. Impact on Governance and Representation:

Jaffrelot (2019) contends that ONOE might reduce the accountability of elected representatives by removing mid-term elections, which serve as a mechanism for course correction.

4. Constitutional and Legal Challenges:

The implementation of ONOE requires significant constitutional amendments, particularly to Articles 83, 172, and 356. Jha (2022) emphasizes that the constitutional framework was designed to ensure democratic flexibility, which ONOE might restrict.

5. Voter Behavior and Democratic Participation

Vaishnav (2018) notes that Indian voters distinguish between national and state elections, often voting differently in each. Empirical research suggests that a single election could create a "wave effect," where national parties disproportionately benefit, sidelining regional priorities. This, according to Palshikar (2021), could homogenize the electoral process, diluting India's pluralistic democracy.

Objectives of Study:

1. To Examine the Impact on Federalism and Regional Representation.
2. To Analyze the Effect on Electoral Accountability and Democratic Participation.
3. To Evaluate Governance and Policy Implications.
4. To Assess the Constitutional and Legal Challenges of Implementation.
5. To Study the Psychological and Behavioral Impact on Voters.

Methodology:

1) **Sources:** Government reports, Election Commission of India (ECI) documents, academic papers, policy briefs.

2) **Method:** Systematic review of scholarly articles and policy documents.

Comparative analysis of election patterns in India and other federal democracies.

1) Impact on Federalism and Regional Representation:

The One Nation, One Election (ONOE) policy has significant implications for India's federal structure and regional representation. The policy aims to synchronize elections across all levels of government, but critics argue that this could weaken the autonomy of state governments and diminish the political influence of regional parties.

1. Erosion of Federalism:

India follows a quasi-federal system where power is divided between the Union and State governments. The current system of staggered elections allows states to function independently within their electoral cycles. However, ONOE could:

1) Centralize political power, making state governments dependent on national election trends.

2) Reduce state-specific policymaking, as regional parties might struggle to assert their unique agendas when national issues dominate elections.

2. Weakening of Regional Parties:

State and regional parties play a crucial role in representing **local interests**. If elections are held simultaneously:

1) National parties (e.g., BJP, Congress) may dominate campaigns, overshadowing regional issues.

2) Regional leaders may struggle to gain visibility, as national leaders and narratives take center stage.

3. Disrupting the Autonomy of State Governments:

1) If a state government loses majority support before the next synchronized election, it may have to remain in power without a fresh mandate.

2) Imposing President's Rule under Article 356 to maintain synchronization could lead to governance instability.

2. Effect on Electoral Accountability and Democratic Participation:

The One Nation, One Election (ONOE) policy has significant implications for electoral accountability and democratic participation in India. The current system of staggered elections ensures that governments at different levels remain accountable to voters at regular intervals. However, simultaneous elections could reduce direct voter engagement and weaken the mechanisms of political accountability.

1. Reduction in Electoral Accountability:

1) Frequent Elections as a Democratic Check: Staggered elections allow citizens to regularly evaluate the performance of governments at both the national and state levels. Mid-term elections provide opportunities for voters to express dissatisfaction with ruling parties, leading to course corrections in governance.

2) ONOE's Impact:

Governments would be held accountable only once in five years, limiting opportunities for voter feedback between election cycles.

Political leaders may not feel pressured to respond to public grievances as frequently.

2. Decline in Voter Engagement and Participation:

1) Voter Fatigue vs. Continuous Political Engagement:

Supporters of ONOE argue that frequent elections lead to voter fatigue, reducing turnout.

However, studies suggest that staggered elections keep voters politically active, leading to better democratic engagement.

2) ONOE's Impact:

If elections occur only once in five years, voters might feel disconnected from the political process. Regional issues might receive less attention, as national parties and media focus on broader national narratives.

3. Risk of "Wave Elections" and Single-Party Dominance:

1) Impact of National Trends on Regional Elections:

In a staggered system, voters differentiate between **state and national elections**, often electing different parties at each level. ONOE may create **wave elections**, where a single national party gains overwhelming control, reducing political diversity.

2) ONOE's Impact:

National leaders may dominate election campaigns, overshadowing state leaders and local governance issues. Regional parties might lose relevance, leading to a more centralized political landscape.

4. Weakened Role of Opposition and Policy Debate:

1) Continuous Elections as a Tool for Political Debate:

Regular elections ensure that opposition parties remain active in engaging with voters.

Political parties refine their policies based on public sentiment expressed in staggered elections.

2) ONOE's Impact:

A long gap between elections could reduce political debate, as ruling parties might delay addressing public grievances. Opposition parties may struggle to maintain momentum between election cycles.

3. Governance and Policy Implications of One Nation, One Election (ONOE):

The One Nation, One Election (ONOE) policy aims to improve governance efficiency by reducing election-related disruptions and ensuring political stability. However, critics argue that it could centralize power, weaken state governments, and alter policy implementation dynamics. This section evaluates the governance and policy implications of ONOE.

1. Improved Governance Stability vs. Reduced Democratic Accountability:

1) Proponents' View:

ONOE can ensure stable governance by preventing frequent disruptions due to election cycles. With synchronized elections, governments can focus more on long-term policy planning rather than short-term populist measures.

2) Critics' View:

Elections serve as regular accountability mechanisms, ensuring that ruling parties remain responsive to voter concerns. Without periodic elections, governments may become complacent, delaying key policy decisions until the next election cycle.

2. Impact on Policy Formulation and Implementation:

1) Proponents' View:

Governments will have a fixed five-year term without disruptions, allowing for consistent policy implementation.

Administrative efficiency will improve, as the Model Code of Conduct (MCC) will not frequently halt policy decisions.

2) Critics' View:

National and state governments often require different policy priorities; ONOE may push state-level policies to align with national agendas, reducing regional autonomy.

Without mid-term elections, governments may not feel the need to course-correct ineffective policies.

3. Centralization of Power and Weakening of State Governments

1)   Proponents' View:

ONOE will create a more **synchronized governance structure**, reducing conflicts between national and state governments.

2) Critics' View:

A single election cycle may increase the dominance of **national parties**, marginalizing regional leaders and reducing the states' ability to influence policy decisions.

State governments may lose bargaining power, as their electoral relevance will be tied to national elections, making them more dependent on central leadership.

4. Administrative Efficiency vs. Bureaucratic Challenges:

1) Proponents' View:

Reducing election frequency will save administrative and financial resources, allowing the bureaucracy to function more smoothly.

Security forces will not be frequently diverted for election duties, improving law enforcement and governance.

2) Critics' View:

Conducting a single nationwide election will place a massive logistical burden on the Election Commission of India (ECI) and other administrative bodies.

The risk of electoral mismanagement, delays, and malpractices could increase due to the sheer scale of the process.

5. Effect on Political Competition and Policy Debates:

1) Proponents' View:

ONOE will reduce continuous political campaigning, allowing elected representatives to focus on governance rather than election strategies.

2) Critics' View:

The absence of staggered elections may reduce political engagement and discourse, limiting policy debates and voter mobilization.

It could lead to wave elections, where a single party dominates both national and state governments, reducing political competition.

4. Constitutional and Legal Challenges of Implementing One Nation, One Election (ONOE):

The implementation of the One Nation, One Election (ONOE) policy in India faces significant constitutional and legal hurdles. Since India follows a quasi-federal structure with independent election cycles for the Lok Sabha (Parliament) and State Legislative Assemblies, synchronizing elections requires major amendments to the Constitution, changes in legal frameworks, and restructuring of the electoral process.

1. Need for Constitutional Amendments:

ONOE requires amendments to multiple provisions of the Indian Constitution that govern election timelines and dissolution of legislatures.

Articles Requiring Amendment:

- Article 83(2): Defines the five-year term of the Lok Sabha.
- Article 172(1): Defines the five-year term of State Legislative Assemblies.
- Article 85: Deals with the dissolution of the Lok Sabha by the President.
- Article 174: Deals with the dissolution of State Assemblies by Governors.
- Article 356: Provides for President's Rule, which may be misused to dissolve State Assemblies prematurely.

2. Violation of Federalism and State Autonomy

1) Conflict with Federal Structure:

The Constitution recognizes separate electoral cycles for the Union and States, ensuring decentralization of power.

ONOE could centralize elections, weakening the independent decision-making power of states.

2) Consent of States Required:

As per **Article 368**, constitutional amendments affecting states require ratification by at least **50% of State Legislatures**.

Many regional parties may oppose ONOE as it reduces their influence in state elections.

3. Premature Dissolution of State Assemblies: A Legal Dilemma:

1) One of the biggest legal challenges is synchronizing elections without violating democratic principles.

2) **Scenario 1:** If a state government **loses majority** mid-term, should fresh elections be held immediately, or should it wait until the next ONOE cycle?

If **President's Rule (Article 356)** is imposed frequently to maintain synchronization, it may undermine **democratic governance**.

3) **Scenario 2:** If Parliament is dissolved early due to loss of confidence, should state governments also be dissolved?

This could **force stable state governments to resign**, violating the **basic structure of the Constitution**.

4. Legal Complexity in Amending the Representation of the People Act, 1951:

The Representation of the People Act, 1951, which governs the conduct of elections, must be extensively revised to accommodate ONOE.

1) Challenges in Amendment:

Defining a common election schedule for both Parliament and State Assemblies.

Establishing clear rules for handling mid-term resignations, floor tests, and dissolutions.

Determining how to conduct elections if a state government collapses before completing its full term.

5. Overburdening the Election Commission and Administrative Challenges:

1) Massive Logistical Burden:

Conducting simultaneous elections across 543 Lok Sabha constituencies and 4,120 State Assembly constituencies is a huge administrative challenge.

The Election Commission of India (ECI) would require increased manpower, security forces, and electronic voting machines (EVMs) to manage the process.

2) Election Disputes and Legal Challenges:

A single large-scale election could result in widespread litigation, creating delays in government formation.

Courts may be burdened with election-related disputes, affecting the judicial process.

5. Psychological and Behavioral Impact of One Nation, One Election (ONOE) on Voters:

The One Nation, One Election (ONOE) policy has significant implications for voter psychology and behavior. By shifting from frequent electoral participation to a single election cycle every five years, ONOE may alter voter engagement, decision-making patterns, turnout rates, and political awareness.

1. Influence on Voter Decision-Making:

1) Simultaneous elections may blur voter choices between national and state issues.

2) Currently, staggered elections allow voters to differentiate between national governance (Lok Sabha) and state governance (State Assemblies).

3) ONOE could lead to "nationalization" of elections, where voters prioritize national parties over local concerns.

2. Risk of "Wave Elections" and Herd Mentality:

1) Psychological effect of national trends on voter perception.

2) When national and state elections occur separately, voters are more likely to vote differently based on local and national governance performance.

3) ONOE may trigger wave elections, where a dominant national party sweeps both Lok Sabha and State Assembly seats.

3. Impact on Voter Turnout and Engagement:

1) Potential increase or decrease in voter turnout depending on election dynamics.

2) Supporters argue that ONOE could reduce voter fatigue, leading to higher turnout as citizens participate in a single, decisive election.

3) However, studies suggest that frequent elections keep voters politically active. With ONOE, voter engagement may decline between elections, making it harder to sustain democratic participation.

4. Shift in Voter Awareness and Political Discourse:

1) Elections serve as political awareness campaigns.

2) Regular elections keep voters informed about government performance, policies, and emerging political issues.

3) With ONOE, voters might be less exposed to issue-based campaigns, reducing their ability to hold governments accountable.

4) Political parties might focus more on mass media-driven narratives rather than grassroots mobilization, shifting voter behavior towards personality-based rather than policy-based voting.

5. Psychological Effect on Minority and Regional Voters:

1) Smaller parties and regional movements may lose visibility.

2) Voters belonging to regional, ethnic, or linguistic minorities might feel marginalized if national issues dominate election discourse.

3) The psychological impact of ONOE could lead to voter disillusionment, where regional voters feel their concerns are overshadowed by national debates.

CONCLUSION

The One Nation, One Election (ONOE) policy presents significant challenges to India's democratic framework, particularly in terms of federalism, electoral accountability, and voter behavior. While it aims to enhance governance stability and reduce election-related costs, it risks centralizing power, weakening regional representation, and limiting voter engagement.

The synchronization of elections may lead to wave elections, reducing political diversity and overshadowing local issues. Additionally, the constitutional and logistical hurdles raise concerns about its feasibility and long-term impact. A careful, inclusive, and democratic approach is essential before implementing ONOE to safeguard India's pluralistic and decentralized political system.

REFERENCES

1. Achary, P. D. T. (2018). Parliamentary Democracy in India: Perspectives and Challenges. Sage Publications.

2. Austin, G. (1966). The Indian Constitution: Cornerstone of a Nation. Oxford University Press.

3. Bhargava, R. (2008). The Promise of India's Secular Democracy. Oxford University Press.

4. Dave, D. (2020). "Electoral Cycles and Democratic Governance: A Critical Analysis." Indian

5. Journal of Constitutional Law, 8(2), 33-49.

6. Jaffrelot, C. (2019). India's Democracy at 70: Illiberal Elements in a Democratic Election. 7] Princeton University Press.

7. Jha, M. K. (2022). "Judicial Perspectives on Electoral Reforms in India." Indian Law Review, 4(3), 45-60.

8. Kumar, M. (2022). "One Nation, One Election: A Threat to Pluralistic Democracy?" South Asian Journal of Political Science, 10(1), 5-18.

9. Mehta, P. B. (2017). The Burden of Democracy. Penguin India.

10. Palshikar, S. (2021). "Electoral Patterns in India: Understanding Voter Choices." Journal of South Asian Politics, 9(2), 78-92.

11. Suri, K. C. (2013). Political Parties in South Asia: The Challenge of Change. International IDEA.

12. Vaishnav, M. (2018). When Crime Pays: Money and Muscle in Indian Politics. HarperCollins.

13. Yadav, Y. (2019). "Electoral Democracy and Accountability in India." Economic and Political Weekly, 54(25), 12-16.