

Dynastic Politics is a ~~AA~~ worst Mockry to Democracy.

Outline:-

(A) Introduction

• Thesis Statement: Dynastic politics undermines the very fundamental principles that democracy upholds, as it empowers dynasties, not people, and undermine the efficiency of democracy.

(B) How dynastic politics empowers dynasties rather than people

(C) What a true democracy offers?

(C) How dynastic politics empowers dynasties not people

(1) Power consolidates among political families.

↳ Fat political dynasties of Philippines.

(2) Lesser opportunities for the people from lower class to rise in politics.

↳ Leadership of PPP, PMLN and others.

(3) Legislature serves dynasties rather than people.

↳ Critique of 18th Amendment (favours dynastic politics)

(4) -

(D) ~~Mows the efficiency of democracy.~~

(E) ~~Diminishes meritocracy in governance.~~
↳ Family ceiling. 'Nepo babies'

(F) ~~Promotes personality politics, over development oriented politics.~~
↳ Battle of the Begums, Bangladesh.
↳ PIDE research

(G) ~~Democracy do not flourish at grassroot levels.~~
↳ Sindh local government Act 2013.

(H) ~~People loss interest in Politics.~~
↳ Low voter turnout.

(I) ~~Dwindles equal economic activities.~~
↳ Sugar mills ownership by political dynasties.

(J) ~~Education as an important tool to eradicate dynastic politics.~~

(F) Conclusion.

The Essay.

After years of struggle, bloodshed, and sacrifice, people from around the world managed to end the diabolical, oppressive, and egregious rule of dynasties that deemed to rule the people as their inherited right. Their rule was replaced with a form of government that promised to disperse the ultimate power among the people, known as democracy. However, what would happen if these dynasties adopt to this new form of governance and hijack the power from the people through dynastic politics? The answer is simple. They will consolidate the power among their family members, as they are the most trustworthy to them. They will not ~~people from the~~ avoid writing such confusing statements lower class to challenge their political clout and legislature will enact laws to serve their purpose.

Their incompetent heirs will replace those with the acumen for governance. More importantly, they will ~~heirs~~ erode the efficiency of democracy. Their incompetent will replace those with the acumen for governance. Their surname will be used to legitimise their rule, rather than for what they have done for people. Moreover, democracy will not flourish at grassroots level, leaving people with little or no interest in it. Besides power, wealth will also consolidate around themselves. All such developments run counter to the fundamental principles that democracy seeks to uphold. Hence, dynastic politics undermines the very promise that democracy upholds, as it empowers dynasties, not people, and undermines the efficiency of democracy.

To understand how dynastic politics is detrimental for the democracy, one must first understand what democracy promises. In a democracy, ultimate power lies with the people. Anyone has the right to assume power through free and fair elections. However, since not everyone can directly participate in elections, they elect their representatives, who constitutes parliament. The sole purpose of parliament is to enact laws in the best interests of people. Moreover, by continuously participating in democratic processes and exercising the power of their vote, the people ensure that governance is merit-based, serves their interests, and provide equal economic opportunities for all. All these factors reflect what democracy truly promises. However, dynastic politics undermines this essence of democracy.

connectivity from one passage to another one is fine

Dynastic politics empowers dynasties, not the people; as power in dynastic politics it tends to consolidate power among family members. In dynastic politics, major government positions are held by the family members of ruling dynasty, as this helps preserve control, ensure loyalty, and maintain the family's political dominance and influence. For instance, in Philippines, 78% of governors, 73% of congressmen and 57% of mayors come from dynastic families. The major share of these key positions lies with the Marcos family. These figures illustrate that political dynasties hold significant sway in the Philippines government. Therefore, the capture of key political positions by dynastic families significantly empowers them, often at the expense of general public.

Moreover, dynastic politics diminishes the chances of individuals from lower socio-economic backgrounds to advance in politics. Political dynasties often centralise power within a single family, leading to key positions being held exclusively by family members or passed down as hereditary roles. For instance, in Pakistan, two political dynasties, the Sharif family and the Bhutto family, hold the key positions in Pakistan's major political parties, namely Pakistan Peoples Party and (PPP) and Pakistan Muslim League Nawaz (PML-N). Currently, the key party positions of PML-N are occupied by the Sharif family, Nawaz Sharif as President of the party, his daughter as CM of Punjab, and his brother as Prime Minister of Pakistan. Similarly, PPP's leadership has been passed on as hereditary role since its genesis. Such trends significantly undermines democracy within a political party, preventing people from other backgrounds from competing for key positions, as these roles are seen as the innate right of family members of party leaders. As a result, common people remain distant from politics, and political dynasties empower themselves politically.

Besides this, dynastic politics compels legislators to serve the interests of political dynasties rather than the people. As political dynasties holds significant sway over political clout and party politics, their effects are also reflected in the legislature. To illustrate, the 18 amendment to the constitution has its clause that favours dynastic politics. Article 63A was amended to clarify and strengthen the party.

leader's authority to disqualify law makers who act against party lines. This article stipulates that a member of parliament can be disqualified if they do not follow the objectives of the party leaders on key matters such as the election of the prime minister and chief minister, votes of no confidence, and money or constitutional bills. Since Pakistani politics is dominated by dynastic influences, this article further strengthens their position. This clause discourages independent decision making and reinforces the central role of the party leader. In this way, the legislature of Pakistan has been used to empower dynastic politics. Therefore, dynastic politics forces legislators to serve the interests of political dynasties, thereby consolidating their powers.

As dynastic politics confines power within political dynasties, it is not the only consequence. It also undermines the efficiency of democracy.

Firstly, dynastic politics negatively affects democratic meritocracy. In a democracy, everyone has equal rights to assume power, but those with proven competence are entrusted with greater responsibility, such as through civil services exams and key positions in the cabinet. However, dynastic politics corrupts the system with nepotism by appointing personal hives to key positions. This erodes the concept of meritocracy in democracy. To illustrate, Miftah Ismail, after holding the office of Finance Minister for just five months, was replaced by Ishaq Dar, a relative of the President of the current ruling party. Following

his departure from the ministry, he commented in an interview on TRT World that non-family members are often viewed with suspicion in mainstream political parties. This highlights how even key political figures can face 'family ceiling' in an arena dominated by dynastic politics. Moreover, its repercussions ~~are severely felt~~ can also be felt in governance in democratic countries. Therefore, by promoting nepotism, dynastic politics erodes the governance efficiency of democracy.

In continuation, dynastic politics promotes personality politics over development-oriented politics. The politics of dynastic heirs often revolve around the surnames of the predecessors, as it allows them easily muster support and legitimise their positions. For example, in Bangladesh, Sheikh Hasina, daughter of Sheikh Mujib, and Khaleda Zia, widow of General Zia, have used the legacies of their predecessors to legitimise their roles as leaders to two main political parties. Both have promised to uphold the legacy of their predecessors, representing ideologies that are drastically different - Islamist and Secular - to secure votes and supports. This demonstrates how dynastic politics use personality politics as a major tool to legitimise their roles. However, as their politics are driven by personality, they show little interest in improving the socio-economic conditions of the people. For instance, according to research by Pakistan Institute of Development Economics (PIDE), constituencies with non-dynastic winners show better delivery of public services than those with dynastic winners. Hence, dynastic politics not only promote personality politics but also negatively affect development in democratic governments.

Additionally, dynastic politics hinders democracy from responding to the grassroots level. Dynastic political dynasties tends to centralise power, consolidating authority among family members. This results in weaker local governments. For instance, Pakistan, People's Party — party run by political dynasty — in 2013 passed the Local Government Act 2013, which emasculated the Mayor of Karachi, stripping him of his power over major city functions. Such acts significantly undermine the performance of local governments. For instance, Dawn reported in 2025, 205% of union councils in Balochistan — Province headed by the same party — over-inactive have been inactive for two years since the last elections. Weaker local governments are detrimental for democracy to flourish. As Alexis D. Tocqueville argued in his book Democracy in America that the major reason American Democracy emerged stronger than other British colonies was the strong local governments. Therefore, by centralising political authority and ensuring weaker local governments, dynastic politics obstructs democracy from growing stronger.

Moreover, in dynastic politics, people lose interest in politics and democracy, which also adversely affect democracy. According to Pakistan Institute of Development Economics (PIDE), constituencies with dynastic politics reported lower voter turnout compared to constituencies without dynastic politics in elections of 2007, 2013 and 2018.

This has a harmful impact on democracy, as Lord Acton has argued that for democracy to thrive, it requires continuous effort and involvement from the people; otherwise, other powers weaken

its strength. Therefore, as dynastic politics diminishes people's interest in participating in democratic processes, it erodes the efficiency of the democracy.

Lastly, dynastic politics undermines equal economic opportunities. As power becomes concentrated within politically dynasties, and legislators serve their interests, economic policies of democratic governments tends to prioritise political dynasties first. A clear example of this is Pakistan's sugar industry, where the majority of shares are controlled by political dynasties such as the Sharif, Taseen and Chaudhry families. These dynasties have leveraged their political influence to maintain dominance over the sector. Since 2006, the Punjab government has imposed a ban on the establishment of new sugar mills, stifling competition. This leads to unequal economic opportunities, directly contradicting the fundamental principles of democracy. In conclusion, political dynasties not only use their power for economic gain but also erode the very essence of democracy by fostering unequal economic opportunities.

To conclude, dynastic politics, by consolidating power within political dynasties, undermines the efficiency of democracy and erodes its fundamental principles. First, it fails to empower people, as power becomes concentrated within political dynasties. The lower class find fewer opportunities to rise in politics, and the legislature which should serve the people, instead serves the interest of dynasties. Second, dynastic politics weakens democracy and undermine its fundamental principles by prioritising surname over competency competence for key positions in governance.

undermining meritocracy. Moreover, it does dissuade democracy from entrenching itself at grassroot levels to hold the power within political families. As a result, people lose interest in politics and democracy, which significantly harms democracy, as it relies on active participation from the public to thrive. Furthermore, dynastic politics erode democracy's basic principle of providing equal economic opportunities for all. Ultimately, democracy is hollowed out by the dominance of dynastic politics, turning it a mockery of its values.