

Benevolent Dictatorship is Preferable to Corrupt Democracy.

1. Introduction

2. Benevolent dictatorship is preferable to corrupt democracy:

- a. A benevolent dictator can make swift decisions without bureaucratic delays; common in corrupt democracies
- b. A benevolent dictator ensures accountability which is often neglected in corrupt democracies
- c. Benevolent dictatorship ensures law and order, avoiding political chaos ^{that} arise from corrupt political rivalries.
- d. Benevolent dictator favours merit based governance which is not seen in corrupt democracies.
- e. Benevolent ruler prioritize national interest over divisive identity politics that thrive in corrupt democracies
- f. Benevolent dictator protects public welfare, unlike corrupt democracies who embezzle funds.
- g. Benevolent leader ensures economic progress
- h. Benevolent leader resist external influence

unlike corrupt democracies who sell national interests for personal gain.

I. Benevolent **dictator** prevents vote buying, which is often seen in corrupt democracies.

J. In emergencies, a decisive dictator ensure efficient management of crisis, while corrupt democracies often delay due to political calculation.

K. A ruler who governs with justice earns people's respect, unlike corrupt elected officials.

3. Counter arguments on the idea that a benevolent dictatorship is preferable to corrupt democracies.

a. There is no accountability in dictatorship which can turn the power of dictator into tyranny.

b. There is no mechanism to ensure that a dictator remains benevolent and the public cannot replace him.

c. Dictatorships restrict freedom, which can still be exercised and fought in a corrupt democracy.

4. Conclusion

The vote, often celebrated as a symbol of freedom, can sometimes empower the very hands that plunder a nation. In a world where democracy is idealized, it can also become a convenient disguise for corruption, and exploitation. History reveals that, at times, a single honest ruler without electoral backing has served the people better than a multitude of elected leaders driven by self interest. "A benevolent ~~dictator~~ can make swift decision without bureaucratic delays, which is common in corrupt democracies. A benevolent leader ensures accountability which is often neglected in corrupt democracies. Benevolent dictators ensures law and order, avoiding political chaos that arises from corrupt political rivalries. Benevolent dictators favour merit based governance which is not seen in corrupt democracies. Benevolent dictators prioritize national interest over divisive identity politics that thrives in corrupt democracies. A public welfare is protected

by benevolent dictator unlike corrupt democracies who embezzle funds. Critics argue that, there is no accountability in dictatorship which can turn the power of dictator into tyranny. They argue that there is no mechanism to ensure that a dictator remains benevolent and the public cannot replace him as it is performed in democracies. While democracy is widely regarded as the ideal form of government, in contexts where democratic institutions are deeply compromised by corruption, a benevolent dictatorship characterized by stability, accountability, and public welfare—may prove more effective in delivering good governance.

Benevolent dictatorship is preferable to corrupt democracies because a benevolent dictator can make swift decision without bureaucratic delays; common in corrupt democracies. A corrupt³ politician in democracies delay the decision making process.

and try to incontinize themselves on the expense of masses. Democracies also involve many stake holders in decision making which in corrupt democracies look for their benefits and neglect policies that benefits masses and harms them. However, a benevolent dictator does not prioritize himself, he efficiently make's decision that benefit masses. Moreover, a benevolent does not need to involve large swath of people in decision making, he makes swift decision what he thinks best for his people. For instance in China, the government's centralized power enabled swift decisions during covid-19 pandemic, including the construction of one thousand bed hospital in ten days in Wuhan. In contrast, in Pakistan a democratic state - government indecision led to delayed lockdowns and higher casualties in early 2020.

A benevolent dictator ensures accountability which is often neglected in corrupt democracies. Democracy is meant to

ensure accountability but corrupt leaders in democracies neglect accountability and transparency which threatens them over their acts of corruption. However, a benevolent leader avoids corruption because it harms his nation. He favours accountability and transparency because he knows that without it a state cannot prosper. For example, Singapore under Lee Kuan Yew implemented a strict anti-corruption policy. By 2020, it ranked 3rd on Transparency International's corruption Perception Index. It is evident here, a benevolent dictator can ensure accountability which is overlooked in corrupt democratic governments.

Moreover, a benevolent dictator ensures law and order, avoiding political chaos that arises from corrupt political rivalries. In democracy, there are various political parties clashes on difference of narratives and interest. In the corrupt system their political rivalries manipulate people leading to chaos and disturbing

law and order situation in a country. In contrast in dictatorship ^{then there would be rivalry} political parties are not allowed and when it comes to benevolent dictator he would ensure law and order in the country and avoids unnecessary chaos. Foreexample, in China under Deng Xiaoping ensured decades of political stability compared to political rivalries in Pakistan, where democratic transition led to chaos and lawlessness. It shows that, as compared to corrupt democracy a benevolent leader can effectively ensure law and order.

Furthermore, benevolent dictator favours merit based governance which is not seen in corrupt democracies. A benevolent dictator may appoint qualified professionals instead of distributing power based on political loyalty or bribes, as seen in corrupt democracies. Take for example, South Korea during the Park Chung-hee era (1961-1979) technocrats were appointed based on skill rather than party loyalty, leading to industrial growth.

- unlike Pakistan, where democratic leaders often appoint unqualified allies to key posts. Hence, a benevolent leader dictator favours merit based governance as compared to corrupt dictator.

In addition to this, benevolent dictator prioritize national interest over divisive identity politics that thrive in corrupt democracies. In corrupt democracies, leaders gain votes based on ethnicity, caste, or region - leading to ethnic favouritism, rather than supporting collective national interest. In contrast, a benevolent dictator - not needing to appease voting blocs - can rise above such divisions and focus on national interest. For instance, Lee Kuan Yew in Singapore maintained a strict policy of racial harmony and meritocracy. He ensured equal opportunity for Chinese, Malays and Indians - prioritizing national unity over ethnic divisions. In contrast, in India, politicians secures votes by promoting hate against muslim leading to division among masses.

Conclusion

Hence, a benevolent leader is more effective in ensuring national interest as compared to corrupt democrats who leads to division.

Apart from this, a benevolent leader protects public welfare, unlike corrupt democrats who embezzle funds. In democracy corrupt leaders extract all the public welfare funds to make maximum wealth. A benevolent dictator, being free from corruption prioritize the welfare of people as compared to extraction of funds for development. For instance, in Cuba, despite economic constraints, Fidel Castro's regime ensured free education and healthcare for all; whereas in democratic Pakistan, corruption in public distribution systems leaves many poor without basic needs. It shows that benevolent dictator, being free from corrupt practices prioritizes the welfare of the people.

Moreover, a benevolent leader ensures economic progress. As compared to corrupt democratic leaders who follow extractive policies that incentivise them, a benevolent leader implements inclusive policies which lead to economic progress and overall socio-political development of the country. It is evident through the Singapore's economic success under Lee Kuan Yew. Hence, an environments plagued by inefficiency and corruption, a benevolent dictatorship proves more effective in laying the foundations of economic prosperity.

Along with this, a benevolent leader ~~resists external influence~~, unlike corrupt democrats who sell national interests for personal gain. A benevolent leader protects the sovereignty of the country. A benevolent leader would not allow foreign manipulation that threatens the sovereignty of the ^{or national interest} country. For example, North Korea, despite being extreme, maintains national sovereignty from foreign influence. Many democratic African states falls prey to foreign debt traps and IMF dictates due to weak

corrupt leadership.

Beside this, a benevolent ~~dictator~~ ensure efficient management of crises, while corrupt leaders often delays the process due to political calculation. A sincere dictator enforce necessary measures, and ensures national coordination without opposition hurdles. Foreexample, during national disasters, countries like China and Vietnam (authoritarian) often respond faster than countries like Pakistan where provinces and central governments clash politically. Hence, in time of national emergency, the clarity and speed of a benevolent ruler can mean the difference between catastrophe and recovery.

Lastly, a ruler who governs with justice earn people's respect, unlike corrupt elected officials. As a benevolent dictator work for the progress of country and betterment of the masses, they would in return respect and love him. As compared to, corrupt leader of democracy who manipulate people and gain incentives at the expense of people. People would hate such leaders when exposed to them.

-3-

Forenample, certain political parties in Pakistan due to their corrupt practices lost mandate, however, in Singapore Lee Kuan Yew with his benevolent leadership gained maximum support from people.

In contrast to this, critics argue that, there is no accountability in dictatorship which can turn the power of dictator into tyranny. They argue that ~~where~~ dictator is not answerable to anyone which increases the risk of unchecked power turning into oppression. Foreexamples in Turkmenistan, Saparmurat ruled with unchecked power, resulting in absurd policies and cults of personality - something difficult to obtain in democracies, where there is check and balance.

Moreover, there is no mechanism to ensure that a dictator remains benevolent and the public cannot replace him. In democracy people can easily remove bad ruler but dictator cannot be replaced.

easily. They believe in the phenomena that power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely and when benevolent leaders corrupts then there is no phenomenon to remove him. Foreexample, Libya under Muhammad Gaddafi began with reforms but descended into tyranny, torture and civil war. It shows that, benevolent leader can also become corrupt and his removal is difficult.

Furthermore, Dictatorship restrict freedom, which can still be exercised in corrupt democracies. Dictators restrict free speech, political opposition, and civil liberties. Dissent is labeled as disloyalty while in corrupt democracies, citizens still retain the right to protest, and challenge the government through elections and courts. Foreexample, the Chinese Communist party maintains strict control over media and public dissent. However, in corrupt democracies like Pakistan, India, citizens still exercise freedom of

Speech and protest. It is evident here that freedom of speech is best exercised in democracy rather than under dictatorship.

To sum up, although democracy is a best form of government, but in the content of corrupt democratic ~~pro~~ leaders a benevolent dictatorship characterized by accountability, public welfare and stability proves to be more effective. When democratic leaders started plundering people ~~thand~~ ^{sincere} any dictator exist who could save nation then he is best at that time to lead the nation. Benevolent dictator is preferable over corrupt democracy because benevolent leader ensures economic growth. He would resist external influence unlike corrupt democracies who sell national interest for personal gain. He would prevent rigging which is often seen in corrupt democracies. In emergencies a decisive dictator ensures efficient management of crisis while corrupt democracies often.

delay the process due to political calculations. Furthermore, a ruler who governs with justice earn people's respect, unlike corrupt elected officials. Moreover, he would ensure accountability, law and order and meritocracy. He would prioritize national interest and public welfare as compared to corrupt democracies. In the time of democratic failure, benevolent dictatorship is a ray of light for the development of nation. Despite the flaws in both systems, the hope remains that governance, whether democratic or authoritarian can evolve toward integrity, justice, and public welfare.