



It seems almost a rite before the elections: The long series of debates and tensions to compose electoral lists and to see who comes in, who comes out, and who is higher or lower on the ballot.

Because democracy, as it is understood in many places, does not choose only parties, but those who are in those parties. Some, more competent, others, strangers surrounded by mystery, others, unfortunately, very dishonest.

Questions arise: Why does X go into the list? Why And has passed from the first places to the last? What does Z have to dispute at the same time as two political parties?

The Normal citizen presence the show as if it were in front of a game of children, in which everyone seeks to ensure the best places. The higher up, the safer to occupy an armchair...

The sad thing is that it is almost "normal" that lacks transparency to know the mechanisms that follow the parties for their inclusions and their exclusions, and that appears on the electoral lists unknown names for the people.

If democracy were a healthy system, that is to say, oriented towards the pursuit of justice and the common good, this would not happen. Because in a well-carried democracy the lists would not be elaborated behind the scenes or in a climate of intrigues not very advisable.

What would do a healthy democracy is to prepare the list of candidates with a clean, visible process. The parties would look for qualified people, and they would be able to explain to the voters why these specific names appear on the list.

That is Why it is worth a sincere effort by politicians and societies to make democracies, with or without parties, strive to promote those who are going to work for such improvements as are desired by all.

Because then the electoral lists will aspire to include competent and honest

people, and so the voters can choose with a good knowledge of the cause of those they consider fit to promote the common good since their work in Parliament.