

Latent heat in our politics

So far I know our constitution is not a doctrinal scripture with sheer conformity. Likewise, its democracy is also not a rigid institution. The former one is changeable, and the later one is adaptable and tunable through proper parameters in course of time. Since the independence most of the constitutional changes, except a few which are more or less clear, were done at the sake of abstruse necessity; who knows whether for a particular political party or politician benevolence. The politician never cared of the public opinion whether they like the change or not, or shrug of it. Each adult individual only feels as an election unit, rather than a democratic unit, and only at the eve of election. On this particular ground the brand of political institution – democracy – here seems to act within some defects. Our leaders always take the utmost advantage by hammering at the defective part with the force of convinced mass cluster. As an obvious consequence, we have been observed a destructive political dynamics that never gave chance to democracy it deserves to be stabilized followed by peaceful public desire. The politicians always preserve the latent heat of such dynamics for the time they need. At a certain degree of shaking the latent heat sometimes dissipates enough energy and at such political vortex, the democracy changes its upper mantle through a great transformation as it were. But, since it is not a result of spontaneous public impulse, rather artificial manufacturing of some politicians, it runs how long they wish to engineer. Thus a civil war-like phenomenon takes a permanent position in our political activities. Sometimes (i.e. 28th October, 2006) it seems a great transformation might engrain but none could show proper heroism at the expense of public trust. When a huge mass taking part in the procession or demonstration in any political demand in the capital or elsewhere I don't think that they respond to respective political party ideals. Rather, I believe, in most cases, they respond to personal possession that may range from daily meal to industrial pursuits. In my evaluation, apart from family hierarchy, the status quo leadership capacity here is designed mostly with the command of capital and muscular credit, and partly with sycophantic arts graced to respective higher ranks. In the possessive sphere leaders are hero of action, but in the sense of public betterment they may be considered as politicians (?) of empty words, street harangues and lucrative false promises. Right at the moment, we can clearly feel that the latent heat once again started releasing and we don't know the degree of further destruction. Probably, in the previous manner the politicians prefer to preserve so since such machineries are their essential elements of murky politics. But, in any sane case, if we transform the bedrock of their political impulses and passions, democracy surely settle down here, and peddle itself onward. On the other hand, if we underestimate their evil engineering, we may lose what we may not achieve by a time scale of tens of years –a crude estimation.

Ajmiry Ahmed
Goettingen, Germany