Inside Out
Political Reforms

An In-Depth Analysis of the
Issues with our Political System
And an Innovative Solution

Krishna Sharma
97018 76024
isopr.in

Number of words: ~2,700. Reading time: ~10 Minutes

After years of research and in-depth analysis of our political system, our submission is this: abolish territorial constituencies and give each voter multiple votes—say, a dozen. The first will empower leaders, the second will empower voters, and together, they will transform the system from the inside out. Almost all major and minor problems would resolve automatically, and a number of positive developments would follow. The country's development would accelerate, and the system would begin to function as originally envisioned by the Constitution. Life would improve for voters, leaders, super leaders (those aspiring to the top posts of prime minister and chief minister), and political parties alike. We urge political parties to introduce a bill in Parliament to bring about these two changes and pass it into law.

Without constituencies, leaders no longer need to look for votes within a constituency, and pretend to be all things to all people within a constituency. Instead, they can attract voters from the entire state or nation. Just as entrepreneurs identify unmet needs and unfilled gaps of various segments of the population, and bring along products and services to meet those needs and fill those gaps, the political leaders too can identify the unaddressed issues and concerns of the people and bring about policies, programs and services to address those needs and concerns. They can build their own voter bases—drawing support from various communities, professions, trades, individuals with special needs, or those united by a shared cause, such as Dalits, farmers, persons with disabilities (Divyangs), environmentalists, and others.

Each section of the population—be it SC, ST, BC, OBC, FC, or any of the subcastes—no longer fractured into small slices within each constituency—can come together and elect its own leaders, thereby finding representation exactly in proportion to its numbers, without the need for a caste census, which freezes the political system into a caste framework for eternity and wrongly labels even caste-indifferent voters as casteist, or reserved constituencies, which have proven ineffective in uplifting weaker sections and violate democratic principles by forcing voters of all castes to elect leaders of a specific caste.

In this model, leaders will be ranked based on the number of votes they receive, and the top 543 (or a corresponding number in the states) will be declared elected. In the current system, leaders are expected to represent all voters in a constituency—including those who did not vote for them or did not vote at all—resulting in what are, so to speak, arranged, forced, or namesake marriages between

leaders and voters. These weak, uneasy, and often resentful relationships lead to low expectations from the electorate toward their elected representatives.

Winning candidates often secure their mandate with the support of only about 30% of the total electorate, leaving the remaining 70% to accept the choice made by a minority. With this happening in every constituency and in every election, the nation is perpetually under minority rule—an issue that often goes unnoticed.

In the new model, leaders represent only those who actively choose them. No voter is represented by a leader chosen by someone else. As a result, the relationships between voters and leaders are stronger: voters can be upfront about their expectations, and leaders can be open and frank about their vision and ideas.

In this model, the voter bases of elected leaders can vary widely in size. To ensure fair representation for voters in the legislatures, elected leaders will be granted Proportional Voting Power—that is, their voting power in the legislature will be proportional to the number of votes they received. This ensures that each leader's influence on the floor reflects the actual level of support he or she commands among the electorate.

In the current system, leaders often have to mortgage their independence to political parties in order to secure a party ticket. In the no-constituency model, however, leaders are backed by their own voter bases and no longer face the recurring uncertainty of obtaining a party ticket or the risk of losing an election by a narrow margin. This enables them to build lasting relationships, engage in honest and meaningful conversations with voters, and present long-term visions and genuine solutions rather than resorting to quick fixes.

Leaders may still choose to join political parties if they wish—but on their own terms, exercising independent voices both inside and outside the legislatures. Debates and voting in the legislatures will be issue-based rather than whip-driven, breaking away from a practice that is fundamentally anti-democratic and suppresses the healthy expression of diverse opinions.

With multiple votes, voters can support multiple parties by distributing their votes among them in any proportion they choose. Currently, with a single vote, they are forced to pick just one party among many, and their vote is interpreted as total support for that party and complete rejection of all others—which often may not reflect their true views. Moreover, their vote is seen as an endorsement of the entire party manifesto. Voters who disagree with certain provisions or policies in the manifesto have no way to express their dissent and may end up supporting policies that go against their own interests.

In this new system, voters, by choosing a leader of their choice, endorse only the specific issues, solutions, and policies that the leader stands for—not the entire manifesto of a political party. Political parties can no longer claim a mandate for their entire manifesto. Voting for an individual leader, rather than a party, is precisely how it is laid out in the Constitution. Political parties, let us not forget, are extra-constitutional entities—essentially pre-poll alliances forged by strong leaders, ideologies, or the course of history.

In the current model, anyone aspiring to the top post of prime minister or chief minister must build significant clout within a political party or establish one of their own. In contrast, the new model allows such leaders to rise based on personal merit, vision, and public trust—just as Atal Bihari Vajpayee and P. V. Narasimha Rao did—by earning the respect and confidence of not only their own party members but also leaders across party lines. Their leadership stands as proof that the

enormous baggage that often comes with political parties is not necessary for forming an efficient, respected, and stable government.

In the current system, political parties fight tooth and nail because even a small drop in vote share can result in a disproportionate loss of seats. As a result, they are compelled to field candidates with enough muscle and money power to win elections by hook or by crook—one of the root causes of widespread criminality and corruption. Fielding a "wrong candidate" risks not only internal dissent but also losing the election. In the new model, things change fundamentally. Political parties no longer need to find “winnable” candidates for each constituency—because constituencies no longer exist. Instead, they can release an endorsed list of candidates from across the state or nation—leaders known for their dedication to specific issues, fields, or segments of the population. Voters can then choose anyone from this list based on alignment with their own concerns and priorities. The total support a party enjoys is reflected in the cumulative votes its endorsed leaders receive, which directly translates into legislative voting power. This system inherently compensates for the absence of internal elections within political parties. While sycophants or close associates of established party leaders may gain clout and secure a place on the party’s endorsed list, they will not be elected unless they have a genuine voter base of their own. Voters who wish to support a party are not forced to vote for a particular leader imposed on them, as is the case in the current constituency-based system; instead, they can vote only for those leaders on the endorsed list whom they truly trust.

Voters—except for the die-hard loyalists of a particular political party—are likely to distribute their votes across various parties and leaders, simply to avoid putting all their eggs in one basket. This means parties and leaders must ‘share the voter,’ much like banks share customers. As a result, they can no longer afford to be hostile toward or demonize one another during elections or within legislatures. Any leader who resorts to such tactics risks alienating voters who may also support other parties or leaders.

This system also dismantles traditional vote-bank politics, which are sustained by political parties through divisive and appeasement strategies. Such tactics simply won’t work anymore. Voters with multiple concerns—and multiple votes to express them—can no longer be neatly boxed into a single segment of the population or voting bloc. Instead, they simultaneously belong to several overlapping segments. For example, a Dalit teacher who also happens to be a Divyang is part of the Dalit community, the teaching community, and the Divyang community all at once. A BC artist belongs not only to a BC caste group but also to the entertainment industry. A woman from an agricultural family may be concerned about farming, women’s issues, and her children’s education—and may distribute her votes among three different leaders, possibly from two or three political parties, or even independents—defying conventional vote-bank arithmetic. In a system that enables both leaders and voters to focus on real issues, appeasement and divisive politics naturally lose their relevance and effectiveness.

Leaders may often champion causes that come into conflict—such as environmental protection and infrastructure development. But democracy demands that they collaborate and work out balanced, thoughtful solutions, rather than digging in their heels and turning each issue into an emotive battleground. The new model makes such collaboration inevitable. Leaders must remain mindful that voters might have supported both sides—voting for each of them on different issues. As a result, no single cause can dominate the discourse. All issues must be considered on equal footing. This is further reinforced by the fact that no leader can push a bill solely on the strength of their own support; they must win the backing of other elected leaders in the legislature. Thus, leadership is tested on two essential fronts: during elections, leaders must convince voters of their vision; in the legislature, they must convince their fellow leaders. That is the true hallmark of democratic

leadership. In contrast, under the current system, a party chief holding the top post can steamroll or block legislation based on personal whims—often resulting in one-man shows. This behavior would be curbed entirely under the new model, where each leader carries an independent mandate from the people. Each leader's vote count transparently reflects their individual popularity and the public importance of the issue they represent. No leader can harbor illusions about their standing or mislead others about their influence. Nor can anyone use party clout to bully or arm-twist fellow legislators into supporting what they do not truly believe in.

Without territorial constituencies, the thorny issue of delimitation fades away. Leaders no longer represent just their region—they represent issues of national importance, and their voter bases span the entire country. A leader from the Northeast dedicated to sports development, for example, isn't a "Northeast leader," but a national one—just as Gandhi wasn't seen merely as a Gujarati leader, nor Bose as a Bengali leader, but both as leaders of the nation. Leaders from regions with high economic but low population growth can attract support from regions with high population but lower economic development, and vice versa, based on shared concerns. This reorients the Lok Sabha to its original constitutional role: representing national interests. State-specific concerns, as envisioned by the Constitution, remain the domain of the Rajya Sabha.

With national and state elections decoupled from local factors and issues, criminality and corruption are likely to decline significantly. Muscle power, which can influence voters in localized pockets, loses relevance when leaders must appeal to electorates spread across an entire state or the nation. Money power, too, becomes less effective, as distributing cash or incentives—especially covertly—is far less viable at scale, at least for individual leaders, if not for entire parties. Moreover, even under the current system, cash and other inducements have become necessary but are no longer sufficient to sway voters—especially when all major parties resort to the same tactics. Voters may accept what reaches their doorstep, but they ultimately vote for leaders they genuinely trust. Moved by conscience, many may choose to give at least one or two of their multiple votes to principled leaders—whose presence can help restore the decorum of our legislatures and the integrity of public discourse and legislative debate, both of which are sorely lacking today.

The Constitution envisions the legislature as a watchdog over the executive. Yet, the current party-based system undermines this role, as the executive is formed by the same party that holds a majority in the legislature. This alignment often leads to blind allegiance rather than meaningful oversight. In contrast, under the proposed system, every elected leader commands an independent voter base and is free from political compulsions to shield a non-performing executive. This restores the legislature's intended role as a check on executive power.

The current system suffers from a serious yet often overlooked flaw: the loss of capable parliamentarians due to narrow electoral defeats. Many good leaders, with valuable experience and insight, are sidelined for an entire term simply because they fall short by a small margin—often due to factors unrelated to their performance or potential. At a time when good leadership is already scarce, this kind of "leadership leak" only deepens the crisis. In the proposed model, no such loss occurs. Every leader who commands sufficient support from the electorate gets elected—regardless of who else wins more or fewer votes. This ensures that public leadership talent is retained and not wasted.

Allowing candidates to contest from multiple constituencies is a peculiar feature of our current system. In the proposed model, this becomes impossible because there are no constituencies, and unnecessary since a candidate's support from across the entire nation or state is aggregated. By-elections, which are costly and disruptive under the current system, would be eliminated. Instead, upon the death, disqualification, or resignation of a Lok Sabha member, the next candidate

in line—effectively the 544th member—would automatically be declared elected. This streamlined process can similarly apply to Vidhan Sabhas.

* * *

The current Electronic Voting Machines (EVMs), which can accommodate up to 384 candidates, are inadequate for the proposed model—where thousands of candidates may need to appear on every machine across a state or the nation. To address this, we propose the development of Advanced Voting Machines (AVMs) capable of handling thousands of candidate names. These machines should also enable voters to cast multiple votes easily and intuitively using touchscreens and QR code scanners, while retaining essential security features such as VVPAT. (Further technical details are included in the presentation.)

By integrating the voter authentication technologies developed for Remote Voting Machines (RVMs) with the expanded capacity of AVMs, voters could cast their ballots from anywhere in the state or country. Those traveling for business or leisure, migrant workers in distant towns, or members of nomadic communities would no longer need to return to their native place to vote. This flexibility would also enhance voter anonymity, allowing individuals to vote in a location where they are unknown—shielded from social pressures or subtle coercion to favor any particular party or candidate.

The Constituent Assembly might well have embraced a no-constituency, multiple-vote model for its many advantages, but—constrained by the limitations of the paper ballot system—it had to settle for the constituency-based, single-vote model, fully aware of its many shortcomings. We, however, are at a far more advanced point in human development, where digital-age technologies make the no-constituency, multiple-vote system entirely feasible. Just as we brought the banking system into the digital era with UPI and are now reaping its many benefits, it is time to usher our political system into the digital age with Advanced Voting Machines (AVMs) and unlock the full range of advantages outlined above.

* * *

The End.
June 8, 2025