



A registered Political Party
ECI Registration No. 56/89/2011/PPS-I

MANIFESTO OF MAI HEE BHARAT

Dr. Subodh Chandra Roy

MSc., PhD., LL.B.

National President

Bharat, that is India, proclaims itself an independent, sovereign, democratic nation. A core tenet of democracy dictates governance according to the will of the majority, mandating the realization of their desires. If we accept Bharat as a functioning democracy, then *everything* that transpires here *must* be interpreted as a direct manifestation of this majority will. Therefore, the pervasive hunger, illiteracy, unemployment, and ill-health afflicting millions, the state's capricious and arbitrary actions cloaked in legal authority, and the rampant, endemic corruption permeating every level of society—all of these demand our absolute,

unquestioning silence. Because, if this charade of democracy holds any truth, then none of these abhorrent realities could exist without our explicit, collective consent.

Just as a father provides sustenance for his family, farmers nourish the entire nation. This logically elevates the collective farming community to the rightful title of "Father of the Nation." Yet, when we are confronted with the horrifying reality of hundreds of thousands of farmers driven to suicide by hunger and debt, where can this so-called democratic Bharat possibly conceal its utter disgrace? This stark contradiction admits only one explanation: under the guise of democracy, the people of this nation are subjected to a continuous, contemptible charade.

Before addressing the core issue, let's consider the pervasive problem of corruption. The public clamours for its eradication at all costs, citing it as the primary obstacle to national progress. Demands are made for the repatriation of billions of rupees illicitly funnelled out of the country. But here, a crucial question arises: does this imply that the majority of this nation is inherently dishonest? How else could such a system persist within a supposed democracy? Such vast sums could not be transferred abroad without navigating established legal channels, implying the implicit consent of the majority

to this very plunder. It's a truism that a leaky pot cannot hold water, yet we persist in pouring water into precisely such a vessel. By refusing to either repair or replace this flawed system, we guarantee continued, rampant waste.

But just as salt cannot be purged of its salinity, corruption cannot be eradicated from this nation. This is because injustice forms the very bedrock of this state. To understand this, we must examine the true purpose of the rules and regulations we call "laws." For centuries, the British ruled this land with one singular objective: the unimpeded exploitation and plunder of its resources. Just as one might bind the limbs of a body to draw blood more easily, the people of Bharatvarsha were bound by a multitude of laws. These laws effectively transformed them into slaves of the British Empire.

Despite this oppression, many dared to dream of independence, enduring unspeakable torture, including execution by hanging. The colonial rulers showed no remorse in the massacre of thousands of unarmed, innocent men, women, and children at Jallianwala Bagh in Punjab, a slaughter carried out by indiscriminate gunfire. We were told that this horrific act was conducted entirely "according to established legal procedure." It's crucial to remember that these "laws" were crafted by the British Parliament with the express

intent of extinguishing any notion of freedom and liberty from the minds of the people of this land.

Countless books proclaim that on August 15, 1947, the territory called "India" emerged as an independent nation, fulfilling the dreams of our revered freedom fighters. However, a closer look reveals that on that day, much like countless other British laws, only another Act—the "Indian Independence Act, 1947"—came into force. When questioned, virtually no one has claimed to have personally seen this Act. They simply read in newspapers or heard on the radio that the country became "independent" on that day. In reality, this Act did *not* establish "India" as an independent country. Within the former British territory of "India," the Act merely created two "new dominions": "India" and "Pakistan." Where there was previously one colony, "India," it was simply divided into two parts—essentially creating two colonies for administrative convenience, termed "new dominions" in legal parlance. Crucially, the Act stipulated that the power to choose the Executive Head of each dominion—the Governor-General—did *not* rest with the people of the respective dominion. Instead, the British Monarch appointed the Governor-General, as explicitly stated in Section 5 of the Indian Independence Act, 1947.

It's a startling fact that while the Act is titled "Indian Independence Act," the word "Independence" itself appears nowhere within its text. A year prior, in 1946, the British government established the Constituent Assembly to draft a constitution for the dominion. It's pivotal to remember that none of the members of this Constituent Assembly were "citizens of India." The term "citizen of India" first appeared in the "Constitution of India," which came into force on January 26, 1950. Until at least that date, all inhabitants of the British territory were legally British subjects. Therefore, everything contained within that Constitution was inherently subject to the will of the British Monarch. This very same Constitution remains the supreme law of the land, and even if desired, it cannot be replaced by the free citizens of this country with a new one. This is because any attempt to replace the Constitution would be blocked by a Supreme Court ruling prohibiting amendments to its "basic features." And let us not forget that the Supreme Court itself was created under a provision of that same Constitution.

This means that the former colonial masters have also dictated the precise mechanisms to govern ourselves. Given this reality, where is our independence? To illustrate this more clearly, consider this analogy: Imagine a land sale where the seller stipulates that he will, out of his "benevolence," build a hut on the land,

and the buyer, after the purchase, is obligated to live in that hut. The buyer may repair the hut if needed, but he is strictly prohibited from demolishing it—that is, altering its "basic features"—and building, say, a concrete house. If this condition persists after the completion of the sale, then, in the eyes of the law, the sale is void, as the seller's control over the land has not been fully relinquished.

Let us concede that during the tumultuous period when this subcontinent was undergoing immense upheaval, accepting such a condition might have seemed like the only way to navigate the crisis. However, in that case, the Constitution needed to include an Article explicitly stating that, after "independence," Parliament would have the power to ratify the Constitution and, if necessary, create a new one to replace the old. As is demonstrably clear, no such ratification Article exists within the Constitution. This means that a Constitution designed for the British Dominion known as "India," and suitable to the British Monarch, has been imposed upon the people as the supreme law of the land. This stands in stark contrast to the dreams of our esteemed freedom fighters, who sought to liberate the people of Bharat from British rule and exploitation. The fundamental requirement for this liberation was to dismantle the oppressive British-made shackles known as "laws,"

which were designed to keep British subjects in perpetual subjugation.

Even after August 15, 1947, and even after January 26, 1950, the majority of British-made laws remained in force in the territory now known as "India." Through provisions within the "Constitution," these British-made laws were given a new lease on life, maintaining the very same constraints that had kept the populace immobile for centuries. Consequently, the country continues to be ruthlessly plundered, with people cleverly ensnared by laws they barely understand. Current estimates suggest that approximately thirty million cases are pending in Indian courts at any given time. Assuming at least ten people are directly or indirectly affected by each case, this means nearly three hundred million people in Bharat are perpetually burdened by legal anxieties. It's no surprise, then, that their circumstances fail to improve, despite the constant rhetoric about so-called "inclusive growth" that we hear year after year.

The fact that we have not yet achieved true liberation is evident in our daily lives. Before August 15, 1947, both non-violent and violent protests against British rule were commonplace, and the Royal police routinely responded with brutal persecution of freedom fighters. This was understandable at the time, as the police, as servants of

the Crown, were obligated to act ruthlessly to protect the sovereign's interests. However, it's deeply disturbing that similar police atrocities remain prevalent even after Bharat is supposedly politically independent. If this independence is genuine, then whose interests are the police now protecting? If democracy has truly made the people masters of the land, then why are these same people protesting? If, as in a democracy, we are the lawmakers, what compels us to break the very laws we have created? The time has come to confront these questions directly, and we—the people of this land, all of us, simply as human beings—must do so ourselves.

In this context, we must examine the true meaning of the word "country." A territory inhabited by human beings is what we call a "country." Without human beings, a country cannot exist. For example, despite its vast expanse, the moon is not a country because it is uninhabited. This demonstrates the intimate connection between "human beings" and "country." Logically, then, a country's development must reflect the progress of its people, as a country cannot advance while leaving behind those who constitute it. It is often claimed that the majority of people in this country are "lagging" on some artificial scale of advancement. This is a deliberate misrepresentation. To perpetuate this manufactured discrimination, the majority is intentionally kept in a state of disadvantage. From the very inception of society,

the seeds of discrimination were carefully sown to ensure that a privileged few could reap the benefits of the labour of the toiling masses.

If the people whose labour is indispensable were to unite as a cohesive whole, the privileged few could no longer maintain their dominance over the vast majority of society. Therefore, by fostering discrimination among the population, they have been reduced to fragmented, weakened individuals. As such, they rarely dare to question the suffering they have endured for centuries. This pattern will persist unless certain deeply ingrained, traditional ideas are drastically altered—and the power to effect this change lies with the people themselves. To change the country, one must first change oneself, which requires the capacity for independent thought. But without human beings, the very concept of a country is meaningless. Therefore, for any human action within a country, the people themselves bear the responsibility. Since "we" is the plural of "I," I am, in essence, the country. I have directly created it. Without me, there can be no country!

Someone might ask, "Can such a seemingly small idea truly improve the country's current state?" The answer is a resounding yes because a change in "I" inevitably signifies a change in the country. Even then, someone might object, "If this idea is so powerful, then the

people's misery would have ended long ago. Besides, the country *has* progressed significantly, even making remarkable advancements in space technology. By your logic, this should mean a substantial improvement in the living conditions of the people." In response, we must acknowledge that the benefits of this progress are enjoyed by only a tiny fraction of the population, while the vast majority remains excluded. Starvation, malnutrition, and suicide are still rampant among the majority. The root cause of this disparity is simply that the idea of "I am the country" has not yet permeated society.

It is precisely this lack of consciousness that prevents the country's deplorable condition from changing. If the people were to awaken to this realization, it would undoubtedly create significant upheaval in a social system built on ruthless exploitation. To prevent such a scenario, a small number of exploiters deliberately dismiss this idea as utopian. They fear that their entire corrupt edifice would collapse like a house of cards if the people were to recognize their true position in society. But the truth is that this idea is not only *not* utopian, but also a remarkably simple method for dismantling this so-called civilized system. To keep this obvious path hidden, efforts have been made from the very beginning to keep the majority of people in the darkness of illiteracy and poverty. The time is now ripe to find a way

out, and we must all strive towards this goal, for we are the very embodiment of this country!

To understand the state of affairs in this country without resorting to complex theories, let's use the analogy of a large house hosting a lively celebration. It's nighttime, the house is brightly lit, and the guests are enjoying themselves. Suddenly, with malicious intent, someone cuts off the main power supply. The entire house is plunged into darkness, and chaos immediately ensues. People become frightened and try to escape, but the darkness hinders them, leading to confusion and panic. They stumble over each other, furniture is overturned, and general disorder reigns. The question then becomes: how do we escape this seemingly endless chaos?

To those unfamiliar with electricity, resolving this chaos might seem incredibly difficult. Some might even attribute the situation to negative human traits like meanness and selfishness. However, the solution is remarkably simple: one only needs to flip the main power switch back "on." The mere return of light will instantly dispel the chaos caused by the darkness. Similarly, the root cause of all the problems in this vast land lies hidden in the darkness of ignorance within our minds. Unless this ignorance is eradicated, these problems will persist indefinitely, and we will continue to fight each other as enemies, unable to recognize each

other as friends in the darkness. But we must understand: no one has deliberately switched off the light. In the history of human civilization, the light of total awareness has never truly been switched on. This is why most people in the world have been deprived of independent thought. However, we are determined to dedicate ourselves to this seemingly impossible task of becoming aware of our true inner strength. And the time for this is now.

To begin, let us consider the name of this country. From ancient times, it was known as "Bharatvarsha." A civilization flourished on the banks of the Sindhu River, which, in foreign languages, became known as the Indus Valley Civilization. However, even before the rise of this civilization, a highly advanced civilization already existed in the southern part of this land, as evidenced by descriptions in the epic Ramayana. Yet, foreign invaders, for their purposes, coined the term "Indus Valley Civilization" to encompass the entire land and named the country "India." Strangely, even after "independence," this great ancient land is still officially called "India." While individuals may sometimes have multiple names, how can a single land have two official names: "India" and "Bharat"?

A stark example of our deeply ingrained subservience is found within the Constitution itself, where the country is

named "India, that is Bharat." It's telling that the phrasing isn't "Bharat, that is India." The name "India" is prioritized, presumably for the convenience of our former British rulers. Since we declare ourselves truly independent, we should adopt "Bharat" as the sole name of our country, rejecting "India." Many have studied the "Mahabharat," but no one has ever heard of something named "MahaIndia." Let us banish the term "India" from our Bharat, for it is nothing more than a mark of our past enslavement.

Because the candle of true awareness has never been lit, the people have never truly experienced freedom. From the very beginning of organized society, controlling power has been vested in the hands of the "king." His commands became law; his word was final. But we fail to recognize that the very "kingship" of the king, the supposed source of all laws, is itself fundamentally illegitimate. Let us reiterate: we will address this matter directly, without resorting to convoluted or elegant theories.

To illustrate this, let's imagine a day in prehistoric times, even before the formation of human society. A small river flows, and on its bank stands a mango tree. One man is climbing the tree, plucking mangoes. A short distance away, another man is fishing. A third man then appears. After observing them for a moment, he

approaches the man in the tree and asks, "What are you plucking, my friend?" The man replies, "Fruit. Would you like to try one?" The stranger takes a ripe mango, finds it delicious, thanks the "mango-man," and then goes to the fisherman. After a similar exchange, he receives a fish as a gift and thanks the "fish-man."

The next day, the stranger returns, this time with a friend. They first visit the mango plucker. Upon learning that the newcomer also wants to try mango, the man in the tree shares his fruit with even greater enthusiasm, feeling honoured to do so. They then repeat the same process with the fish man. Notice that by consuming mangoes and fish without any effort, the strangers gain nearly double the energy of the toilers. The toilers expend roughly half their energy climbing the tree or catching fish, while the strangers expend none. In this way, through deception, the third person gradually becomes more powerful by consuming the fruits of others' labour. As his strength and influence grow, people begin to fear him. What was once freely given as a favour becomes compulsory "protection money" over time, ultimately establishing him as the lawmaker and the king. This marks the beginning of the king's exploitation of the people under the guise of the "Rule of Law."

This cunning individual began his "kingship" through deception—in other words, illegally. What began as acts

of charity, given out of goodwill, was transformed into the forced collection of revenue, or taxes. Various policies have been implemented over time to ensure the smooth collection of these taxes from the population. One such system, now elevated to the status of near-scripture, is called Economics. Since "might is right" is the prevailing principle, the king can do no wrong and is always considered unquestionably correct. As the sovereign's command is law, law-abiding subjects are obligated to obey the king.

The people did not willingly accept the king's sovereignty; they were coerced into submission through brute force. However, the king is acutely aware that his existence depends entirely on the presence of obedient subjects. The fact that these subjects fail to realize they are the true source of all power, that they are all equal and belong to the same human family, has created a division among them from the very beginning of this exploitative system. Beyond the distinctions of rich and poor, educated and uneducated, high and low, countless other artificial categories were meticulously fabricated, inventing different religions, castes, and so on. In this way, people have been divided into countless groups, divisions that never existed and could never exist in nature. The naive subjects, preoccupied with senseless infighting, failed to recognize this cunning manoeuvre

by the king. This is how the tentacles of monarchy completely consumed human society.

In light of this, it's important to recognize that the term "poor" is a misnomer. Conventionally, a person is labelled "poor" if he struggles daily for basic survival—for instance, a coal miner. Risking his life every day, he descends into the mine to extract coal. Without coal, could there be coal-fired power plants? Could the massive industries that rely on coal even exist? Ultimately, the true source of this immense wealth is that very "poor" worker. How, then, can we dare call the very creator of such colossal wealth "poor"?

Let's now consider the word "uneducated." How can we, the so-called "educated" people, label a farmer or a shoemaker as uneducated? It never occurs to us that we, who boast of our education, cannot perform the tasks that a farmer or shoemaker does with ease. Are we not, then, also illiterate in their skills? The reason they often lack formal education is that they have been denied such opportunities. It's akin to deliberately breaking someone's leg and then pitying him for his "misfortune."

So-called democracy followed the monarchy. Driven by envy of the king's power, certain individuals conspired to seize control. They understood that true power resides with the people, so they used the word "demos" (people)

in "democracy," ostensibly conveying the idea that the people directly manage the country's affairs. However, the reality is that "democracy" is simply another form of monarchy. The only difference is that instead of a single king, as in a monarchy, there are multiple "ministers" in a "democracy."

Just as the shackles of slavery had to be maintained to enforce the king's authority, so too, in so-called democracies, all the laws from the monarchical era have been retained to ensure the uninterrupted plundering of the people. As a result, the people's role as providers of wealth remains unchanged, just as it was under the monarchy. Therefore, the widely touted idea that "we are all kings" in a democracy is pure poetic fancy, with no basis in reality. In "democracy," it is said that the people's representatives will "direct" the country's affairs, but in practice, certain individuals chosen by political parties are "ruling" the country. It's no coincidence that we still use the term "ruling party." No one questions how "rulers" can exist after "freedom" has been achieved, or even the relevance of the word "government" in a "democracy."

Elections are held in this country according to the Representation of the People Act, 1951, but those who "contest" these elections are not true representatives of the people. In almost every case, they are controlled by

one political party or another. Therefore, their primary responsibility lies with their party, not with the people. It would be reasonable to assume that all election candidates prioritize the welfare of the country's citizens. It would also be reasonable to expect that political parties have clear, well-defined plans to achieve this goal. If this were true, why is there such intense competition to "win" elections? Consider a simple analogy: if several people were discussing the best colour to paint a house, one might suggest white, another pink, and a third grey. Yet, all of them would presumably share the common goal of making the house look beautiful. If they are not enemies, why does this same collaborative spirit not exist in politics? It doesn't because maintaining mutual hostility is essential to perpetuating the exploitative status quo. Therefore, it is clear that without a fundamental change to the state system, genuine progress and improvement of the people's condition are impossible. To achieve this change, we must first eliminate the sources of our weaknesses.

We often wonder how a single individual can change the inertia of an entire system. First, we fail to recognize that the country's current state is a direct consequence of our collective inaction. This inertia will inevitably end once we begin to act. Second, I am not alone. More than one billion three hundred million "I"s together constitute

present-day "India." Each "I" is intimately connected to the others, much like the countless cells that form the human body. When the body is injured, the entire body reacts at once, and trillions of cells work together to defend against the aggression. This demonstrates the immense energy of a single cell when connected to other cells. Similarly, each of us is a vast reservoir of enormous power, of which we are largely unaware.

When all the people of this land realize that we are all members of the same family and that we complement each other, our collective consciousness will awaken. Just as in an ideal family, there is no place for corruption, similarly, there will be no reason for corruption to exist in the country. Just as a problem is shared by all members of a family, we too will share every problem that arises in any part of the country. No one will starve anywhere. This will simultaneously eradicate all causes of hatred, envy, or jealousy from people's minds.

Furthermore, since humanity's place in the world is considered paramount, money should occupy a subordinate position. However, the opposite is true in reality, so we must consciously reevaluate the role of money. Nothing should be above humanity, not even money. Since "democracy" is a misnomer, let us give this ideal system a new name. As the people's existence constitutes a country, we have coined the term

"GANASATTA" in Bengali to signify that in such a state, the people shall play the supreme role in every aspect of the country's management.

In a so-called "democracy," the people's role is reduced to that of "voters" or "electors," while the actual power to rule over them rests with the "elected" representatives. Once these representatives are "elected"—through whatever means, fair or foul—they seize complete control of the system, and the people become mere silent observers of their misfortune.

Under GANASATTA, this state of affairs will be drastically altered. The people will exercise their true power even *after* the election. A suitable amendment to the election law shall be caused to be enacted by the appropriate authorities, ensuring that an elected representative holds office only at the pleasure of the electors. This means that the people shall have the power to recall an elected representative whenever they deem it necessary, effectively eradicating corruption at its root. Even the *possibility* of such a recall will significantly improve the situation by sending a clear message to those in office.

Once GANASATTA is firmly established, each of us will gradually realize that our existence depends entirely on the well-being of others. We are neither above nor below anyone else; everyone is equally important.

Consequently, there will be no hostility among us, just as there is no enmity among the trillions of cells in the human body. It's essential to remember that the foot, the brain, and every other part of the body are composed of the same cells, making them equally vital. Yet, this natural harmony is absent in human society. The reason is simple: since time immemorial, to prevent the people from uniting, divisions have been artificially created by "kings" through superficial labels and classifications. This is why the real human being remains hidden beneath the misleading, multi-coloured slogan of "Unity in Diversity." When this real human being awakens and takes control, GANASATTA will be established, and in GANASATTA lies the future of the world.

To establish such a social system, a political party called "Mai Hee Bharat" (I am Bharat) has been formed. Because we are convinced that all the people of this land belong to the same family, there can be no real obstacles, as we all desire the overall progress of the country. Please join us, and let us move forward together. The future of this country—which is also our future—will be exactly as we envision it, because without us—without me—Bharat does not exist.

Mai Hee Bharat!

AN EXCERPT FROM THE CONSTITUTION OF

MAI HEE BHARAT

"Article II. Aims and Objectives

The central aim and objective of the Party shall be to integrate the entire population of Bharat into a single large family. All the members of the said family shall be recognised only as individual natural human beings equal in all respects, disregarding any external and artificial marks of distinction imposed upon them relating to religion, race, caste, sex, social status, etc. that keep them perpetually divided amongst themselves.

The Party firmly believes that the root cause of the suffering of human beings inhabiting Bharat lies in the fact that the immense majority of them are always kept away from the mainstream process of decision-making, while only a handful manipulate the affairs of the country as per their own choice ignoring the rest of the population as mere numbers rather than intelligent human beings. As decades have gone by without producing any material change, it is, therefore, high time that people themselves directly take command of the situation so that Bharat can excel in every sphere.

Only by the presence of human inhabitants, a territory is transformed into a country, thus every individual inhabitant of this country is, in reality, synonymous with Bharat. With such a realisation that he is himself Bharat, can instil enormous confidence in every individual to

gracefully come forward in the sacred task of nation-building. Hence, the name of the Party is "MAI HEE BHARAT".

Being guided by this central theme, the Party shall undertake the following course of action:

Paying the highest respect to the sovereignty of a free individual human being and realising that each of them has a common heritage and is one of the masters of this land without whose express command nothing shall move in this country;

that poverty, illiteracy, social discriminations, etc., which are but ingredients of friction causing enmity between individuals, are intentionally created to keep them under perpetual subjugation for exploitation;

that an individual who is described as poor is not poor, on the contrary, he is the only source of wealth;

that the devices of enslavement of subjects made during the colonial rule under the name of so-called "laws" are still in operation in full force with all its blood-sucking tentacles, even though the people are said to be free; and

realising further that any existing system has to be subordinate to the common wishes of the people and cannot act as a means of domination,

Mai Hee Bharat shall be fervently instrumental in all respects to radically change the prevailing social, economic, political and legal systems by calling upon every inhabitant of Bharat to graciously come forward and mind the affairs of the country from a position of strength as well as confidence."