
Inside Out

Political Reforms

An In-Depth Analysis of the

Issues with our Political System

And an Innovative Solution




KRISHNA SHARMA

May 29, 2025
www.isopr.in

Author's Profile

Name	**Krishna Sharma**	
Contact	Ph: **97018 76024** email: krishnadvr@gmail.com	
From	Kavur, Palnadu Dist, Andhra Pradesh, India (Born 1958)	
Education	B.Sc. (Mathematics, Physics and Chemistry) - S.S. & N. College, Narasaraopet, AP M.Sc. (Mathematics and Computer Science) - University of Hyderabad, 1980 Gold Medalist	
Career	Software Engineer / Architect	○ 1981-1989: ECIL, Hyderabad ○ 1989-2018: Various Companies, USA ○ 1996-2000: Founded and ran a software consulting company
Passion	Psychology, Sociology and Philosophy Developed **Foaum**, a framework of psychology, sociology and philosophy; and conducted many workshops based on Foaum in the USA and India.	○ Personality Development workshops ○ Organizational management and team building workshops ○ Family management and parenting workshops ○ Parent-Teacher joint workshops
Books	Human Nature	Sapien Architecture: Understanding Human Nature & Diversity (WiP)
	Ramayana	Translated of Valmiki Ramayana from Sanskrit to English
	Philosophy	Why did Krishna Laugh? (WiP)
Missions	Political Reforms	Inside Out Political Reforms: An In-Depth Analysis of the Issues with our Political System And an Innovative Solution
	Educational Reforms	NEP-2030 A New Educational Paradigm To Transform Indian Education from the Inside Out
	Bharti Lipi	Common 'lipi' and 'code' for Indian languages

In-Depth Analysis and Innovative Solution



Our submission: Most major and minor problems of our political system can be addressed with just two fundamental changes to our Constitution

How Does It Work?

Pre-Election

1. With no constituencies, leaders would seek the votes of voters from across the nation or state, rather than just from a single constituency, based on their dedication to a cause or issue.
2. For example, a leader dedicated to the upliftment of Dalits would seek votes from Dalits across the nation or state; a leader focused on agricultural issues would seek votes from farmers; a leader advocating for Divyangs would seek votes from Divyangs, and so on.
3. Just as universities strive to recruit distinguished professors in diverse subjects from various places, political parties would recruit popular leaders dedicated to a range of issues and causes from across the nation or state. Similarly, just as good professors seek reputable universities, capable leaders would join strong and credible parties.
4. Political parties, instead of struggling to find the 'right' candidate in every constituency, would announce a nationwide or statewide endorsed list featuring popular leaders dedicated to various causes and issues.
5. Leaders would also continue to have the option to contest as independents, just as they do now.

Election

1. Voters with similar interests and concerns—currently scattered in small numbers across individual constituencies—could come together from across the nation or state to elect leaders dedicated to the causes and issues they care about.
2. For example, a Dalit voter who works as a truck driver and has a son serving in the army might distribute his multiple votes among three leaders: one focused on the upliftment of Dalits, another dedicated to the transportation industry, and a third committed to national defense and army welfare.

Post-Election


1. Candidates are ranked based on their vote counts—that is, the number of votes they receive—and the 'top 543' (or the appropriate number in each state) are declared elected.
2. Proportional Voting Power (PVP): The voting power of members in the legislatures will be proportional to their vote counts.

Major Effects

1. Elected leaders represent their respective voter bases—that is, those who voted for them—from across the country or the state, as the case may be.
2. Parties and leaders 'share the voter' with others, as voters are likely to distribute their multiple votes among multiple leaders and parties.
3. Voters of every caste—be it SC, ST, BC, OBC, or FC—can elect leaders of their own in proportion to their numbers, without the need for reserved constituencies or reliance on contentious census data.
4. Elections to national and state legislatures will be completely decoupled from the local factors and factions.
5. Leaders dedicated to national-level issues will be elected to the national legislature; those focused on state-level issues will be elected to state legislatures; and those committed to local issues will be elected to local bodies—strengthening the three-tier administrative system.
6. Leaders who develop their own voter bases can voice their opinions without risking their political survival; they can be confident of getting reelected in the next election, without worrying about securing a party ticket.
7. Leaders will no longer lose elections due to small fluctuations in vote counts.

Electoral Systems

The following book from the Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA)



describes the electoral systems in various democracies around the world and contains advice on designing electoral systems.

The chart on the right shows the electoral system families as described in the above book and where the **Current System** and the **Proposed System** fits within its classification or electoral systems.

The Electoral System Families


- **Plurality/Majority**
  - FPTP (First Past the Post)
    - **Current System**
  - TRS (Two-Round System)
  - AV (Alternative Vote)
  - BV (Block Vote)
  - PBV (Party Block Vote)
- **Mixed**
  - Parallel
  - MMP (Mixed-Member Proportional)
- **Proportional Representation**
  - LIST PR (Proportional Representation)
    - Closed
    - Open
    - Free
      - Panachage Model
        - **Proposed System**
  - STV (Single Transferable Vote)
- **Other**
  - SNTV (Single Non-Transferable Vote)
  - LV (Limited Vote)
  - BC (Borda Count)

Ref: https://www.idea.int/publications/catalogue/electoral-system-design-new-international-idea-handbook

Voting Process

We enable voters to choose from <u>thousands</u> of candidates from across the nation or state with a simple voting process:
Take the Leader Cards of the leaders to the polling booth and scan them into the AVM.


Leader Cards



Front **Back**

1. Election Commission issues LIN (Leadership Identification Number) instead of election symbols to leaders
2. Leaders create their own ‘Leader Cards’ and distribute to voters in paper and electronic form
3. Voters obtain Leaders Cards of their chosen leaders well before the polling date, from websites, social media, eSeva centers, sending SMS or missed call to leaders, etc.

Advanced Voting Machines (AVMs)



Before Voting **After Voting**

1. Polling booths equipped with AVMs with touchscreens instead of EVMs
   - With the same security and VVPAT
   - RVM features can be integrated to AVMs, enabling voters to vote at any polling station anywhere
2. Voters take Leader Cards to the polling booth and scan them into the AVM, after selecting one of the twelve boxes on the touchscreen
   - Dummy AVMs installed at polling stations and mobile applications that mimic the AVM, for practice

The Transformation

In Detail

Pre-Election Dynamics

Current System	Proposed System
Leaders begin their public/political life through inheritance, social service activities, vigilante actions (protection, settlements), intimidation tactics, etc. within their respective local areas. Leaders try to be ‘all things to all people’; no one trusts them.	Leaders begin their public/political life focusing on national or state level issues and causes related to various fields, sectors, areas, communities, etc., Voters trust leaders because of the leaders’ dedication to the specific issues and causes of their interest.
Local voter base makes raising and distributing money 'under the radar' viable. Money and muscle power plays a large role in campaigning.	Raising and distributing money to voters spread across a large areas is not feasible. Leaders have to attract voters with their vision, values and voice.
Parties nominate candidates only from rich and powerful sections as they only have the money power and local clout to run a campaign; candidates in the reserved constituencies are often mere facades, operated by rich and powerful behind the scenes.	Parties can include diverse leaders dedicated all communities, castes, causes, fields and sectors, and popular among the voters.
Parties sometime sideline the senior and experienced leaders and promote young and docile leaders; Sometimes they do the opposite.	Parties cannot sideline anyone or impose anyone on the people, because those who are popular will anyway get the votes, whether their names are included in the endorsed lists or not.
Parties have to field ‘one candidate’ per constituency; they have to deal with internal dissent and ‘wrong-candidate’ risk.	Parties can include all viable candidates, and even not so viable candidates on the endorsed lists without generating party dissent and without wrong-candidate risk.
Parties do not conduct internal elections; sycophants and the ‘near and dear’ of powerful leaders get promoted.	Parties may include sycophants and the ‘near and dear’ of powerful leaders on the endorsed lists, if they so choose; but they won’t win unless they are truly popular among the voters. Hence no need for internal elections in the parties.
Competition among political parties escalates into rivalry and even full-blown hostility due to ideological differences, direct competition, fear of harassment by the winning party, and the involvement of bickering local factions.	Parties can never expect to get *all* the votes of any voter; They have to *share the voter* with others. Demonization of other parties would backfire as voters may get annoyed unfair targeting of the other parties.

Election Dynamics

Current System	Proposed System
Party-loyal voters have no choice but to vote for a candidate imposed on them by the party even if they personally dislike the candidate.	Party-loyal voters can vote for any leader from their party - on or off the endorsed list. This is advantageous to the parties as well. They get all the 'party votes' through one candidate or the other.
Party neutral voters are forced to side with one party or the other because of single-vote.	Party neutral voters can distribute votes to leaders of multiple parties, and independents, as they choose.
Voters who like to vote for a leader of their caste/community can do so only if a leader of their caste/community gets the ticket, which is rare for many sections, the BCs, OBs, sub-castes in SC and ST sections, and even some among FCs.	Voters of all sections of the society can give some of their votes to a leader of their specific caste/community if they wish, and give the rest to leaders dedicated to their profession or a cause or issue or a field of their interest.
SC / ST candidates cannot vote for their own leaders in the general constituencies; even in the reserved constituencies they end up voting for a candidate behind whom the rich and powerful operate.	SC / ST candidates can vote for their own candidates who are on or off the endorsed lists of the political parties or for independents, as they wish. Encourages many mini-Ambedkars to come up.
Even strong leaders can lose an election by a mere fraction of votes, preventing the losing candidates from representing and serving all those who voted for them. History bears witness to the country deprived of the many good parliamentarians, many a time.	Leaders would not lose an election due to small fluctuations in their support base because of top rankers method. Candidates who receive approximately the same number of votes would all either get elected or not get elected. We will never lose the services of great leaders.
Even after getting elected to national and state legislatures, the leaders are made to feel like local leaders. That is why they clamour for ministerial berths, to elevate themselves from local level to national or state level.	By dedicating themselves to causes, communities, issues, fields, and sectors at the national level (or the state level in state elections), leaders will gain national recognition automatically, regardless of weather they get ministerial berth or not.

Strong Relationships

Current System	Proposed System
Leaders receive only a small percentage of *positive votes*; the rest are party votes, negative votes, and random votes, resulting in a weak relationship between leaders and voters.	The majority of votes leaders get in this system are positive votes and a few party votes. There won't be any negative or random votes as there is no direct competition.
Leaders are uncertain about securing a party ticket and winning the next election. They tend to focus on making the hay while the sun shines. They try to be either subservient to a party or jump parties opportunistically for the sake of securing a ticket.	With their dedication to the issues and causes of a field, sector, community or caste, leaders would retain their fan base—unless they commit serious mistakes or are superseded by new leaders with more dedication.
Voters are also unsure whether a leader they truly support will get the ticket and win the next election. They cannot count on any leader who works on their issues on a long term basis.	Voters can vote again and again for the same leaders that they like, regardless of whether a party includes them on the *endorsed list* or not.
Leaders represent not only those who voted for them but also those who voted for other parties and those who did not vote at all. In other words, they are in a "love marriage" with some voters and in an "arranged marriage," "forced marriage," or "namesake marriage" with many others, weakening their commitment to and trust among voters	Leaders represent only those who voted for them, creating an ideal scenario of 100% love marriages. Leaders know the expectations of their voters.
Only a minority of the electorate sees a leader of their choice in power, while the majority of the electorate is represented by a leader they did not choose, leading to disillusionment and apathy.	The majority of voters are likely to see at least one or two of their chosen leaders in power. *See the Note below.*
Leaders, by relying on party votes, tend to stay more loyal to the party than to the voters themselves. Their job is to deliver the party's programs, policies, and services to the voters, but not necessarily to convey the voters' true grievances, needs, and preferences back to the party. As a result, parties too get disconnected from ground realities.	Leaders, known for their expertise in their respective fields, would be recognized by parties as true representatives of the voters who elected them. As a result, parties would rely on these leaders for vision and ideas in their particular fields.This ensures that parties remain connected with ground realities.
Constitution and Democracy sees a vote as a right. But voters are pragmatic and see it as a transaction. "What do I get in return for my vote?" There is no constitutional and statutory power for the Legislators to 'pay back' to the voters in their constituency; hence leaders resort to giving enticements and doing personal favors to the voters, and work as lobbyists to get projects for their respective constituencies.	Each leader, dedicated to a cause or issue, can clearly spell out what one would do for the specific section of voters. In that sense, Proposed System support the natural 'transactional' perspective of the voter. It sets up a 'fair and 'square' relationship between the voters and leaders. When voters can get 'more' for their vote, they won't sell it for 'less'.

Note:
If the combined vote count of the "top 543" falls below 50% of the total electorate, additional candidates—such as the top 550, 600, or 650—can be declared elected to ensure that the majority of voters are represented by a leader of their choice.

Genuine Collaboration

Current System	Proposed System
In this system, leaders must support their party's policies and positions both inside and outside the legislatures, and vote according to the party whip on the floors of the legislatures. They cannot speak their mind on any issue.	By relying less on party votes and more on positive votes, leaders would be able to express independent opinions without fear or favor, both inside and outside the legislatures. This would foster **issue-based** debates and voting in the legislatures, the ideal in a democracy. The 'party whip' tradition, which we borrowed from Britain, which stifles diversity of opinion, and hence, anti-democratic, should be completely done away with.
Not all leaders are equal. Some are admired and respected beyond their constituency, while others may not be known even in the next constituency. However, the system gives them equal voting power on the floor of the legislatures, which is unfair.	With Proportional Voting Power (PVP), leaders would have voting power exactly in proportion to their vote counts. This would give them an incentive to work toward broad-based support for their vision, as it gives them greater voting power in the legislature. This, of course, is fair not only for the leader but also for the voters who supported him or her.
In this system, the true support a leader enjoys across the nation—beyond their own constituency—is never known. A leader does not know their true worth or how it compares to the true worth of others.	Leaders' true worth—measured by their support among voters—would be transparently known to themselves and others. This would make them both humble and confident. No one would be more valued or less valued than their vote-count, because of other factors like party clout.
Party hostilities spill into legislatures. Whatever one party proposes, the other opposes—regardless of merit. The opposition tries to embarrass the ruling party, and the ruling party tries to harass opposition party leaders. Legislative debates are merely a drama, and voting is merely a farce. With party-line voting, the support that a bill, resolution, or motion receives depends more on who sponsors it than on its actual merit. The ruling party knows it can pass anything through its brute seat-based majority.	Legislative debates and voting would become issue-based, as described above. Leaders who can make their proposals acceptable to other leaders would gain the necessary support to execute their vision. Leaders who seek support for bills and resolutions related to their field of passion would, in turn, have to support bills and resolutions related to the fields of other leaders' passion—this is the true art of politics. Leaders would also have to respect the passion of other leaders and recognize the importance of other causes, communities, fields and sectors, as they may be sharing a voter base with those other leaders.

Engaged and Judicious Voters

Everyone prefers long-term solutions over short-term benefits, if they are credible and achievable.

Current System	Proposed System
The majority of voters, constrained to parties and their nominated candidates, feel that they are caught between two evils. Only a few voters are fully convinced about the candidate or party they vote for. Moreover, they are forced to accept the winning candidate even if they voted against them. Voters feel that their vote is not as powerful as it should be, no matter how sacred it is.	In this system, voters can choose leaders who are y dedicated to issues and causes of their interest. This is true empowerment of the voters. Their choices are no longer limited to two ‘all things for all people’ candidates.
Voters realistically have only two choices; a vote for anyone else is considered wasted. This promotes binary thinking, party loyalty, and polarization. Voters who choose a party once often fall into a loyalty trap—they constantly glorify the positives of their chosen party and highlight the negatives of the opposing party. They find it difficult to switch to the another party in the next election, even if their chosen party is underperforming or its candidate is not to one’s liking. Over time, these voters become blind and lifelong supporters of the political parties, essentially pre-approving the policies and positions of party even before they are framed. This removes any incentive for the party to change or improve; instead, the party may stick to the old ways to retain the support of its loyal base. While a loyal voter base and blind support may seem beneficial to the parties, it is detrimental to democracy. Democracy thrives when voters exercise independent judgment and vote thoughtfully in every election.	Multiple votes would wean voters away from binary thinking. A good majority of voters, even today, are party-neutral. They can express their neutrality by distributing some votes to one party and some to another rather than to choose a single leader or party. A single vote is like asking someone, “who is your best friend?”—a difficult question to answer. Multiple votes are like asking, “who are your best friends?”—a much easier question to answer since voters are not forced to pick just one.
Manifestos are an "all or nothing" option for voters. As a result, voters often end up voting for many policies and provisions they do not agree with. The winning party does not know which provisions contributed to its success, and the losing party does not know which provisions led to its failure. The winning party claims the mandate as support for all provisions.	There is no need to develop manifestos in this system. The vision, background of the nominated leaders and the community or cause, field or sector they are dedicated to would reflect what the party stands for. By voting for particular leaders, voters can clearly indicate what matters to them and by how much.

Constitutional Vision

	Current System	Proposed System
Three-tier governance	This system reduces elections to national and state legislatures to local contests. Leaders with local clout, outlook, and appeal get elected to national and state legislatures rather than those with national or state-level clout, outlook, and appeal. Lacking the necessary vision and passion for national-level issues, they weaken national policy-making and governance. Many fields—from education to science and technology to sports and tourism—have experienced slow growth since independence for this reason. There are no champions or tall figures in many fields at the national and state levels.	Leaders contesting for the Lok Sabha would already be well-known at the national level, with their fan base spread across multiple states. Similarly, leaders contesting for the Vidhan Sabhas would be well-known at the state level, with their fan base spread across the state. Thus, leaders with a national vision, outlook, and appeal would get elected to the Lok Sabha, while those with a state-level vision, outlook, and appeal would get elected to state legislatures. Every field would receive the focus and attention it needs at both the national and state levels, making a significant difference in the development of the country and the states in every field.
Center State Relationships	The current system puts elected leaders in a conflict of interest. Are they supposed to work for national development or constituency development? Are they supposed to prioritize national interests or state interests?	With potential pan-India voter bases, the members of the Lok Sabha would have only one responsibility—concern themselves with national development, not state-level or constituency-level issues, which the state and local bodies would handle. Similarly, members elected to the Vidhan Sabhas would have only one responsibility—concern themselves with state development, not constituency development, which local bodies would handle.
National and Regional parties	National parties in power in states weaken state governments unless a strong state-level leader emerges within the party. Similarly, regional party coalitions in power at the center weaken the central government.	As truly national-level leaders get elected to the Lok Sabha and truly state-level leaders get elected to the Vidhan Sabhas, both institutions would grow stronger. Regional party candidates, when contesting for the Lok Sabha, would naturally try to build a pan-India voter base for themselves, transforming them into true national leaders.
Executive and Legislatures	The Constitution envisions that the executive is held accountable by the legislature. However, since both are controlled by the same political party, the legislature rarely holds the executive accountable in this system.	Leaders, by relying mostly on positive votes, would feel more empowered to hold the executive accountable, regardless of the party they belong to. This increases the chances of realizing the true vision of the Constitution, potentially transforming the entire political culture.


Other Benefits

	Current System	Proposed System
Delimitation	Delimitation issues pose a significant challenge today due to uneven population growth. States that have managed to control population growth are at a disadvantage in terms of Lok Sabha representation compared to states that have not controlled population growth.	Delimitation becomes moot in this system, as there are no constituencies in the first place. Lok Sabha will focus strictly on national issues, and members will not represent state interests, as already noted. Moreover, leaders from less populous states can attract votes from more populous states. The focus would shift from 'share' of the states to the 'development' of every state.
Proportional Representation	A small change in vote share can lead to a significant change in seat share in the current system, resulting not only in an undue advantage (or disadvantage) for political parties but also in a misrepresentation of the people's will in the legislatures.	This system guarantees Proportional Representation (PR) for all parties, as the voting power a party enjoys in the legislature would be exactly in proportion to the aggregate votes its leaders receive, because of PVP. (Note: If a party fields too many candidates and its votes get spread too thin among them, only a few of its leaders would secure a place in the 'top 543.' However, political parties would be smart enough not to commit this mistake).
One-man Shows	Power in the current system tends to concentrate around the chief of the political party, unless the party has internal discipline and conducts regular internal elections to prevent such concentration - which is rare. This often results in "one-man" shows, leading to hero-worship and edging on the possibility of dictatorship in the guise of democracy.	his system prevents "one-man" shows in two ways: One, with every leader able to voice their independent opinion, a party chief cannot exercise unlimited power. Two, the vote count of a party chief is unlikely to exceed 10% of the total electoral votes because the chief, being a 'general' leader, may secure only one or two votes from each voter and as these votes would naturally get split among multiple party chiefs.
Leadership Leak	In a contest between two strong leaders, one is bound to lose the election, depriving the nation of that leader's service. History bears witness to many capable parliamentarians losing elections and thus being unable to serve the nation for at least the next five years.	In Proposed System, as already noted, no leader with sizable support among voters will lose to another leader with sizable support. Instead, both will get elected. The nation (or state) will never lose a leader with vision and voice under this system.

Incidental Benefits

	Current System	Proposed System
By-Elections	The resignation, dismissal or death of an elected legislator requires a by-election.	Upon the resignation, dismissal or death of an elected member of parliament, the 544th in the top-rankers list will be declared elected. There is no need for by-election. Similar process will be used in states.
Contesting from Multiple Constituencies	A strange provision, in the current system, allows a candidate to contest from multiple constituencies.	It is neither necessary nor possible in this system for a candidate to contest from multiple constituencies, as there are no constituencies in the first place, and as the candidate can attract votes from everywhere in the nation/state.
Uniform AVMs	The Election Commission needs to configure and test EVMs for each constituency.	The AVMs are same across the nation/state, containing the names and details of all the candidates from all over the nation/state, reduces the burden on the Election Commission and the manufacturers of AVMs.
Anywhere Voting	The voters who are away from the home for business, leisure or other travel have to come to the native place for the sake of voting at the time of elecftions.	By utilizing the 'voter identification methods' developed for RVMs (Remote Voting Machines), the voters can be allowed to vote at any polling station across the nation (or state in the case of state elections). This also increases anonymity, as voters can choose to vote at any polling station, instead of a designated polling station.

Implementation Roadmap



1. Elders (retired politicians, judges, political scientists, etc.) should come together
   - Discuss the model, refine it as needed, and recommend it to the governments and legislatures
   - Elders forum should be accorded the same significance as constituent assembly
2. Phased implementation
   - Proposed System should be implemented in three or four states of different sizes, in different parts of the country, governed by different political parties, to begin with and then adopted in other states and at the centre

Additional Changes

We recommend four other fundamental changes,
each of which makes the system better in its own way.

These changes can be implemented
independently of the previously mentioned Two Reforms
and also independently of one another.

Legislature Terms and Guru Sabha

Three & Five Year Terms:

Change the term of the legislatures to three years, while continuing the executive with the current five year term with the provision of no-confidence motion. Legislatures will be elected every three years, Executive every five years.

Rationale:

1. Five year term for the Executive gives the stability needed for governance.
2. Three year term for legislators gives frequent opportunity for the leaders to present their improved vision to the voters, and course-correct as needed,
3. Three year elections gives voters the opportunity to remove low performing leaders from the system sooner and retain the high performing leaders.

Guru* Sabha:

In addition to Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha, set up a Guru Sabha, with senior retired members of the Lok Sabha, and Vidhan Sabhas. Guru Sabha is privileged to elect/appoint the bearers of all neutral offices:
President, vice-president, state governors, supreme court judges, election commissioners, head of the Enforcement Directorate and Governor of Reserve Bank.

Rationale:

1. Gives the much needed, non-partisan, neutral and objective mechanism to elect/appoint the neutral offices who should work above and beyond partisan politics.
2. We need any institution to leverage the wisdom of senior retired politicians.

Qualifications:

1. Must be between the ages of 65 and 75.
2. Must have a cumulative experience of eight years of serving in Lok Sabha or Vidhan Sabhas
3. Must not hold any political office and must relinquish party affiliation, if any.
4. Barred from holding public office or affiliating with any political party for the rest of their lives.
5. Enrollment in the Elders Collegium is by application.
6. No additional remuneration or benefits are provided, as they already receive a pension as former members of national and state legislatures.

*One of the meanings of Guru is Elder.

Nomenclature and Online Debates

Nomenclature:

Rename:
Lok Sabha as National Leadership Council
Vidhan Sabha as State Leadership Council

Rationale:

The terms like Lok Sabhas, Vidhan Sabhas, MPs, MLAs do not capture the breadth and depth of the role the elected leaders play; the roles and responsibilities of legislators extend beyond legislating, both officially and unofficially.

Official:

1. Legislators become the part of the executive as ministers.
2. They serve on various committees.
3. The hold the executive accountable.

Unofficial:

4. People expect leaders to provide solutions for various issues, isolated and systemic.
5. Serve as social leaders - to provide guidance, moral and material support in good times as well as bad times, beyond the constitutional role.
6. Serve as access points to government institutions and services.

Online Debates and Voting:

Switch from in-person legislative sessions to online debates and voting.

Benefits:

1. No need for the leaders to travel to capital cities, physically assemble in the halls of legislatures, wait for their turn to talk, and compress their message into few minutes allotted.
2. Legislation can be done throughout the year; and leaders can spend time with constituents throughout the year.
3. Leaders can post comments at any time from anywhere, of any length in any language, and any format - text, audio and video, and; can be instantly translated to all other languages by human translators assisted with digital translators.
4. Legislatures can hold conferences and talks now and then, giving opportunities for leaders to meet in person with each other.

Conclusion

In Summary, we are proposing the following four changes, each of which can be made independently of the others:

Retire the concept of constituencies and give multiple votes to each voter (Optionally, reduce the term of legislatures to three years, while retaining the five-year term for the executive)	Optionally, set up an Elders' Collegium to elect the bearers of neutral offices such as President of India, Supreme Court Justices, RBI Governor, Chief Election Commissioner, etc.
Optionally, rename the Lok Sabha as the National Leadership Council and the Vidhan Sabhas as State Leadership Councils	Optionally, switch from in-person legislative sessions to online debates and voting

The End

Please Always Download the Latest version of this presentation at:
https://isopr.in/overview