MODERN AGE REPRESENTATIONAL GOVERNANCE

With
Mobile Voting,
Trust Bases and
Multiple Votes



KRISHNA SHARMA

Modern Age Representational Governance

With Mobile Voting, Trust Bases and Multiple Votes

The technological advances in the modern age such as the Internet, Mobile Phones, Information Systems offer unprecedented opportunities to redesign every sphere of our lives. The banking sector, for example, has completely changed with the advent of the electronic age. Now we can make payments to anyone from anywhere with electronic payments apps, without having to go to a specific branch of a bank during specific hours, stand in a line, withdraw cash, carry the cash, and so on. Similarly, we can now book tickets for air, train, or bus travel, or for movies or for Tirumala Balaji Darshan, without having to go to a ticket counter and stand in line. Developments like these have not only made our lives easy but also catalyzed economic growth.

But we haven't done much in bringing the election process into the electronic age, except for the use of electronic voting machines, which is merely automation of the current process. However, the institution of Aadhaar Cards with digitalized biometrics, and the proposed linking Voter ID's with Aadhaar Cards, present new opportunities to completely redesign the entire election and representation process, stretching our imagination.

Seizing this opportunity, and also taking advantage of the wealth of information about election models available at sources like *Hand Book on Electoral System Design* prepared by the *International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA)*, we designed a new model of election and representation process called Modern Age Representational Governance (MARG) from the ground-up.

The MARG model introduces three new and bold features, 1) Mobile Voting replacing once-in-five-year elections, 2) Trust Bases replacing constituencies, and 3) Multiple Votes replacing single vote. This new model applies to elections and representation at all levels, the center, the state, and the local bodies like Zilla Parishads and the Gram Panchayats, equally. For that matter, this model applies to any democracy in any country.

Just as Mobile Banking improved the lives of everyone, the individuals, the businesses, the banks, the governments, the small men, and the big men, the MARG Model, with the Mobile Voting, Trust Bases and Multiple Votes, is designed to bring a great number of benefits to *everyone*, the voters, the leaders, the political parties and the election machinery, that are hitherto considered to be impossible or infeasible. And at the macro level, it improves the democratic process itself, enabling a better representation of the issues, concerns, and needs of the various segments of the people, be it the majority, the minorities, the different socioeconomic segments, the people of different professions, rural areas and urban areas.

We established an All-Party Forum to review, discuss, refine and finalize this model and work along with the Election Commission of India to impress upon the Government of India, to introduce a bill in the Parliament to pass the necessary legislation and amend the constitution as needed to implement this model.

We invite the leaders and cadres of all political parties, and everyone interested in improving the election and democratic process in India to join this Forum. The details of the All-Party Forum, including how to join it, how to participate in or follow its activities, can be found on the website THEMARG.ORG.

India has been the world leader in democratic practices since independence, adopting such ideals as 'universal adult franchise', giving equal rights to women, oppressed castes, outlying tribes, and so on, from the get-go. We shall continue that lead, and set an example to the rest of the world, by adopting the MARG model as soon as possible, ushering in a new era of sophisticated Modern Age Representational Governance.

The MARG Model

1. This model combines the characteristics of Proportional Representation and Preferential Voting, in an innovative manner. It, however, keeps the election process as simple and easy as the current FPTP model by taking advantage of the advances of the modern age such as the Internet and Mobile Apps and Information Systems.

2. The three key features of this model are 1) Trust Bases that replaces constituencies and 2) Mobile, anytime voting that replaces the one-in-five-year elections, and 3) Multiple Votes that replaces the single vote.

3. In the current model, a candidate who gets, for example, seven lakh votes wins and another who gets six lakh votes loses. In the MARG model, both the candidates will be declared elected, if their vote count is more than a predetermined number of votes, say, five lakhs.

4. In the current model, the winning candidate serves as the representative of the entire electorate of the constituency, i.e., the voters who voted for him/her, those who rejected him/her, those who chose NOTA, and those who did not vote at all. In the MARG model, elected leaders represent only those who voted for them, called their Trust Bases. The predetermined number of votes to declare a candidate as elected is called Minimum Trust Base (MTB).

5. Since everyone who gets more votes than the MTB is declared elected, one might think that the number of elected leaders may double or triple in number in this model compared to the current model. But that need not be the case. The total number of elected representatives, in this model, can be controlled by setting the MTB size appropriately. Setting the MTB size at 1% of the size of national electorate size, for example, yields approximately one hundred national representatives. Similarly, setting the MTB at 0.5% of the size of the electorate yields approximately two hundred representatives, and so on.

6. In this model, Trust Bases take the place of constituencies. Trust Bases are issues- and needs-based. Trust Bases can be spread across the country, unlike the constituencies, which are geographically bounded. In this model, farmers, for example, vote for leaders passionate about farmers' issues, minorities vote for leaders passionate about minority issues, physically handicapped voters vote for leaders passionate about the issues of the physically handicapped. Voters who care for infrastructure issues such as roads vote for leaders passionate about infrastructure, and voters who care for sanitation vote for leaders passionate about sanitation, and so on.

7. It is likely that voters are interested in multiple issues, rather than one issue, and hence should be able to support multiple leaders who support those multiple issues. To accommodate this need, multiple votes, say twelve, are given to every voter, in this model. Voters can give their twelve votes to as many as twelve different leaders, one to each. Or, they can divide their votes evenly, such as two each to six leaders, or three each to four leaders or four each to three leaders, or six each to two leaders. They can also divide their votes in any other odd proportion they like. Voters, thus, can belong to multiple Trust Bases simultaneously.

8. Political parties, in the current model, field one candidate per constituency. In the MARG model, political parties declare a list of countrywide leaders they endorse. Voters can distribute their votes to any of those candidates of their choice. Voters also can also distribute a few of their votes to the leaders of one party and a few more to those of another party.

9. In this model, there are no once-in-five-year elections. Leaders can register themselves as candidates with the Election Commission at any time.

10. Anyone eligible to vote can register oneself as a voter through a Mobile App by providing the details of one's Aadhaar card, Voter Id card, or Citizenship card as determined by the Election Commission. They can distribute their votes at any time to the candidates of their choice through the same Mobile App. Those who do not have a Mobile Phone, or are not comfortable using a Mobile App, can do the same at an e-Seva center. Voters can also, at any time, redistribute their votes to different leaders if they are not satisfied with the

leaders they currently support. Voters may also redistribute their votes when their issues of concern change, such as when they change their professions or migrate to a different part of the country.

11. The sizes of the Trust Bases may change every day as voters distribute and redistribute their votes. The Election Commission, using modern-day computer technology, is responsible for keeping track of the size of the Trust Bases of all the registered candidates and publishing them daily. It is also responsible for keeping the secrecy of the distribution of votes by the Individual voters, similar to the way banks keep the account details of the individual customer confidential while publishing the total end-of-the-day balances of the banks as a whole. Leaders with the sizes of their Trust Bases above MTB are considered deemed automatically elected and leaders with the size of their Trust Bases below the MTB are automatically deemed unelected.

12. The voters' ability to redistribute votes at any time can cause a lot of volatility in the sizes of Trust Bases of the leaders. The sizes of the Trust Bases that hover around the MTB can fall below the MTB one day and raise above the MTB the next day. This could make a leader elected one day and unelected the next day and again elected the following day. This kind of volatility is not desirable. To address this, we incorporate two types of 'cooling periods' of three months each. The first one is called the Voter Cooling Period. A voter has to wait for three months before he/she can redistribute the votes, since the last time he/she has done so. A voter who distributed his/her votes in January, for example, has to wait at least till April to redistribute his/her votes again. A voter who distributed his/her votes in February has to wait at least till May to redistribute his/her votes again. This prevents a voter from redistributing the votes too frequently, and perhaps impulsively. The second one is called Leader Cooling Period. A candidate will be considered elected only if his/her Trust Base size stays above the MTB for three months continuously. Similarly, an elected leader will be considered unelected only when his/her Trust Base size stays below the MTB for three months continuously.

13. By discarding the concept of geographically bounded constituencies and by letting the Trust Bases spread all over the country, the MARG model combines the characteristics of lower and upper houses of the Parliament. It preserves the 'direct election' feature of the lower house and the 'permanent and across the county' nature of the upper house. Hence, with this model, we can actually combine the lower house and upper house into one, simplifying the legislation process. This is up to the Government of India to determine.

14. What happens if a leader's trust base is three or four or ten times the MTB? This can be handled in two ways. We can give such a leader proportionally higher voting power in the Council of Representatives, just as it happens in the world of investors in a publicly traded corporation. The second way to handle this is to deny the leader any additional privileges because of the high size of the Trust Base. In such a case, the leader can be expected to ask the voters of his/her Trust Base to give some of their votes to other leaders whom he/she endorses. This is essentially the concept of a political party. It is left to the APF (All-Party Forum) and the Election Commission and the Government of India to debate and choose one of these two ways. Everyone who reviews this model is requested their opinion in this matter.

15. Though not essential for this model, we suggest introducing certain new terminology as follows. Let us call anyone interested in involving oneself in public affairs APL (A People Leader). An APL becomes a CPL (Candidate People Leader) when one registers onlself with the Election Commission. A CPL becomes an OPL (Official People Leader) when one's Trust Base raises above MTB and becomes a CPL again if and when the size of the Trust Base falls below MTB. An OPL at the National level is called NPL (National-level People Leader), currently known as MP. An OPL at the State level is called SPL (State-level People Leader) currently known as MLA or MLC. We call the Parliament itself NCL (National Council of Leaders) and the State Assemblies as SCL (State Council of Leaders).

16. The rationale for this new terminology is as follows: The current terminology is built around the concept of 'legislation', such as Legislative Assembly and Member of Legislative Assembly. But the role of legislatures in Indian Democracy is more than making legislation. They are also responsible for electing and overseeing the Executive. The members also serve as part of the Executive in the form of Ministers, Chairmen of the government bodies, corporations, etc. Plus, at the ground level, the members also serve as the elders

and leaders of the communities, responding to their social needs, issues, and emergencies. The term OPL (Official People Leader) is better suited to signify the multiple roles played by a leader, compared to the term MLA, which only signifies one of those roles. The term SCL (State Council of Leaders) is, similarly, better suited to signify the comprehensive responsibilities of that body, than the term Legislative Assembly, which only represents one of its responsibilities.

17. This concludes the description of the MARG model in its entirety. Now we will discuss the many problems it solves and the many benefits it brings to the democracy, to the political parties, to the leaders, to the voters, to the minorities, and to the election machinery.

Benefits of the MARG model

The power and benefits of this model may not be readily evident from the above description. Hence, we will now present in detail the numerous benefits of this model and the many problems it solves.

Improvements to the Democratic Process

1. The single biggest flaw in the current FPTP model is that it results in minority rule almost always, contrary to the majority rule expected in a democracy. Let us see how. In the current model, considering the fact that only about 70% of voters turn out in the elections and considering that the polled votes are split between two or three candidates, the winning candidates typically receive only thirty to forty percent of the votes of the total electorate. This is what makes it a minority rule. This also means, on average, on any given day, sixty to seventy percent of the voters do not have a trusted representative in power. This completely contradicts the spirit of democracy, of people governing themselves through trusted representatives. Whereas, in the MARG model, when enough voters are passionate about an issue, they can find a leader who represents them. Further, at least one or two leaders of the chosen leaders of any voter, if not all of them, will be in power and hence will be representing the voter.

2. No wise person puts all his money in one bank, or in one stock, or in one property. Similarly, no voter should put all his/her trust in one leader. No leader is infallible. There could be many leaders who are equally good (or equally bad). But, the current election model, by giving only one vote per voter, forces each individual voter to put all his or her trust in only one candidate. The MARG model, on the other hand, gives the opportunity for voters to distribute their votes to multiple candidates. They no longer have to side with one specific individual leader. They can choose multiple leaders who they consider to be worthy of giving a chance.

3. The election of one candidate, in the current model, implies the rejection of all the other candidates by the voters. But in reality, the defeated candidate also could have had the support of almost equal, albeit, a slightly fewer number of voters. It would be ideal if we can let all the leaders who gained a sizable vote, represent their respective voters. That is what happens in the MARG model. Every candidate whose Trust Base is above the MTB will be in

power representing the voters in that Trust Base. In the current model, a candidate loses to another candidate. In the MARG model, a candidate loses for lack of the ability to attract a sizable Trust Base. The current model sets one candidate against another in a fight. The MARG model sets a target for the leader to achieve.

4. In the current model, voters who voted for a candidate who lost the election, are forced by the system to put their faith in the winning candidate, whom they did not like to begin with. Similarly, the leaders are also forced, by the system, to represent the people who did not vote for them. No leader is a Mahatma and no one will be able to treat the voters who voted for him/her and the voters who did not, in the same way. The MARG model provides an ingenious solution for this problem, by letting the leaders represent only the voters in their Trust Base, and never someone who did not vote for them. This guarantees a trust-based relationship between the representative and the represented, which is a cornerstone of democracy.

5. In the current model, voters feel that their vote is wasted if their chosen candidate does not win the election. Many voters abstain from voting, precisely because they feel that their vote could go 'waste'. In the MARG model, it would seldom be the case. One or two of their twelve votes of the voters may go 'waste', but not all. At least one or two of their chosen leaders are likely to be elected and represent them if not all.

6. In the current model, just a few votes are enough to push a bad leader, who uses all kinds of tricks and demagoguery, into power, and leave a good leader who is principled and straightforward by the wayside. This means the voters have to not only put up with the bad leader but also lose the benefit of being served by a good leader for the next five years. In the MARG model, every leader who can attract enough Trust Base can get into power. Thus the MARG model would propel more good leaders into power compared to the current model. This is precisely what everyone is looking for in India today.

7. Currently, the population distribution among constituencies is not even. Some constituencies have 1.5 to 2 times that of the population of some other constituencies. As a result, the representative of one constituency represents a large number of people, while another leader in another constituency represents only a small number of people. Neither of these situations is desirable. This problem would not get corrected until a census is taken and the boundaries of the constituencies are redrawn, which happens very rarely. There would be no such need to redraw the boundaries in the MARG model as there are no constituencies. And the Trust Base of a representative can be spread all over the country, and the leader would represent exactly as many voters as there are in his/her Trust Base.

8. In the current model, because the leaders are guaranteed power for five years, they can easily turn their backs on the voters, and it happens all the time. Leaders who are seen everywhere before the elections can become completely inaccessible to the voters after the elections. Leaders can promise one thing before the elections and pursue something else after the elections with impunity. The MARG model curtails this kind of behavior, as the voters can withdraw their support as soon as they see the leaders deviating from their promised policies and professed principles.

9. In the current model, voters have to resort to media posts, online petitions, street demonstrations, and protests to express their displeasure or disapproval of the actions of leaders and to call for their resignation. This leads to violence and disruption of life, both for the protesters and for the general public. Organizing such protests and demonstrations and sustaining them for a long time is not easy. The protesters run out of energy and the protests die down without achieving their goal, in most cases. In the MARG model, there is no need for any of such ineffective petitions, demonstrations, protests, or violence. Voters can simply and immediately remove the leaders, whose ethics or performance or attention to the issues become questionable, from power by redistributing their votes to other or new leaders. In other words, a sophisticated and inexpensive 'recall' process is built into the MARG model.

10. In the current model, the winning candidate has to address all the issues of the constituency. This is not an easy task. The candidate may not have the knowledge or passion about each and every issue. Issues, problems, ideas, dreams that pertain to only a small percentage of people, such as handicapped people, or farmers, or people of any specific trade or craft, would never find a champion. Similarly causes like green energy, a clean environment, a better

education system, and so on, which only a few people focus on, will not find a champion. They have to take recourse to activists to highlight these issues. But the activists have no real power to do anything. In the MARG model, such minorities, who are spread across the country can form a Trust Base of the leaders passionate about the specific issues, and thus find champions in them.

11. The Trust Bases in the MARG model get formed around issues, needs, and dreams. Hence, the MARG model propels leaders with a focus on causes and issues in power, rather than just the generic politicians. Political parties are also be incentivized to field leaders focused on certain issues and causes, rather than the generic politicians. Thus the MARG model propels more 'experts' into power rather than 'politicians'. This is precisely what the people of India have been asking for.

12. In the current model, parties fight the election on one or two of the 'hot' issues. Voters get swayed by them and ignore the many other issues that are important in their lives. Whereas in the MARG model, they are propelled to think about each issue that is important to them, while distributing their votes. They are not pushed to make a decision on an emotionally charged election day and live with the consequences for the next five years. They can take their own time to decide which leaders they want to support. Plus, they are not forced to live with their decision for the next five years. They can change their decision, every three months, if they have to. They can also stick with their decision for ten or fifteen years if they want to, without having to go to the voting booths every five years.

13. The MARG model also addresses a key, but less noticed, gap in the current model. Consider the situation, where there is a bill that is good for the country as a whole but requires some sacrifice from the constituency. What is an MLA/MP, in the current model, supposed to do? The Constitution assumes that the MLA/MP would focus on the interests of the country as a whole. But the voters assume that the MLA/MP would focus on the interests of the constituency. These two contradictory assumptions put any conscientious MLA/MP in a bind. In the MARG model, there is no concept of constituencies, and hence this becomes a moot point. The Trust Bases of the MARG model are based on issues. The leaders precisely represent the issues they are passionate about and around which they formed the Trust Bases.

14. In the current model, the governments change every five years. Many government programs meet with uncertainty every five years. The new government, if it belongs to a different party, will try to scrap the programs of the previous governments. It would be worried that the credit will go to the previous government if the programs are continued. Investments made by the previous government thus far in those programs would simply go to waste. This is a loss of national resources and impedes national progress. MARG model solves this problem. Because there are no elections, there would be no such abrupt change of governments and hence no abrupt end to any program. Every program will take its natural course, either to evolve into something better and bigger or to peter out. One of the reasons for China's enormous progress in such a short period is the continuity of the Government. MARG model brings the same kind of continuity and stability but within the fold of Democracy.

15. In the current model, leaders cannot openly express what they truly stand for and what they are passionate about. They cannot boldly propose any ideas that are not in line with the party. They can never speak against the party and the party leadership, regardless of what they do. They have to denounce the other political parties all the time, regardless of the value or correctness of what they say. Only a leader with huge political clout can ever say what he/she truly feels. In the MARG model, it is different. Every leader can express his/her true views, as long as he/she can keep the size of his/her Trust Base above MTB. This is good not only for democracy but also for the political parties. Parties now get a chance to form their agenda based on the collective wisdom of all the independent voices of the leaders of the party. This gives them a firm foundation among many Trust Bases, i.e., among voters. In the current model, if the party chief or leadership does not do well, the party can incur huge losses or even collapse.

16. What are the most important issues that the voters care for? In the current model, there is no clear answer. Political leaders have to always guess about this. Opinion polls help, but they are never comprehensive and reliable enough to make policies. Governments also guess, while allocating the budgets,

what is important to the voters. The MARG model solves this problem clearly and elegantly. The leaders that the voters send to power is a clear indication of the issues that people really care for. And the issues they care for can change over months and years. And that change is reflected immediately because of continuous redistribution of votes.

17. In the current model, one has to be highly political to win. They don't need to have a deep understanding of any issue. There is no need or opportunity for the elected leaders to collaborate to solve problems. They essentially follow the will and command of the party chief. How many issues can we expect the chief to know in depth? And that is the reason, we get many inferior solutions, which create more problems than solve. Whereas, in the MARG model, leaders contest based on issues and needs. The leaders interested in the same issue will come together naturally like the birds of the same feather and collaboration naturally without needing any prodding. Discussing the issues at depth, they will be able to find better, not impulsive or politically-oriented, solutions to the problems. This, essentially, is what one would look for in an ideal democracy. MARG model creates the environment for that ideal situation.

18. In the MARG model, the leaders and the Trust Base are aligned around certain issues, which creates an organic bond between them. This allows the leaders to actually educate the voters about the issues. In the current model, no leader, for example, educates the farmers about their actual issues or proposed solutions, because, for one thing, the leaders themselves do not have a good understanding of the issues and solutions, and for another thing, the farmers do not truly trust their representatives, and for yet another thing, the association between the farmers and the specific leaders may get broken in the next election. In the MARG model, the long-lasting association and trust between the voters and leaders, and the passion of the leaders with the specific issues, create the ideal conditions for democracy to work the way it is intended.

Benefits for the Political Parties

19. In the current model, a party that gets five percent fewer votes could lose as many as ninety percent of the seats. In other words, though two parties could have about the same level of support among the voters, one of them could be completely routed out of power. In the MARG model, with the MTB criteria, both parties would have representatives in proportion to their true support among the voters. No party will ever be routed out of power because of a change of a small percentage of votes. Thus the MARG Model serves as an elegant implementation of the proportional representation model.

20. In the current model, voters who like a specific political party but not the candidate fielded by the party are in a bind. They have to vote either for a candidate they do not like or for a party they do not like. There would be no such dilemma for the voters in the MARG model. Parties, in the MARG model, do not field candidates by the constituency, as there is no concept of constituencies in this model. Rather, the parties announce a countrywide or statewide list of leaders whom they endorse. Voters who want to be loyal to the party can distribute their votes to any of the leaders on that list. It helps the parties retain all the loyal voters, by letting them find a leader they like from a larger list of candidates.

21. In the current model, political parties are forced to choose a candidate who can win the election by hook or crook. They have to go through the difficult political exercise of giving 'tickets' and 'funding' to the candidates. Whereas in the MARG model, parties can endorse a large number of potential candidates, and let the voters decide who among them are worthy. Parties, thus, will know which of their candidates are truly trusted by the voters.

22. In the current model, candidates who are not liked by the voters also can win an election, based on the popularity of the party and the party chief. Such leaders, whom the voters do not like, can erode the popularity and the credibility of the party and party chief in the long run. In the MARG model, candidates who have enough Trust Base only will win. The party develops genuine and long-lasting roots into the Trust Bases of those candidates. The party also gets a deeper understanding of the needs, issues, and opinions of the voters, based on the candidates chosen by the voters.

23. Should a representative, who switches from one political party to the other, lose his/her seat? There has been a lot of debate, constitutional provisions and amendments, and supreme court rulings on this question, but

without a satisfactory resolution. The MARG model answers this question elegantly, by letting the voters decide whether the switch is done for the right reasons or for the wrong reasons. If the voters feel that the switch is done for the wrong reasons, they can simply withdraw their votes to the particular leader and give it to them to another leader. If they feel that the switch is justified, they can continue to support that leader through their votes.

Benefits for the Leaders

24. In the current model, even a leader who continues to enjoy the support of the voters has to prove it by going through an expensive election every five years and facing the associated uncertainty of winning. In the MARG model, a leader can continue in power even for decades, as long as he/she can attract a Trust Base that is above MTB, without ever having to go to elections.

25. In the current model, a candidate who gets even one vote less than his immediate rival loses the election. This makes the elections very contentious. Every candidate is forced to fight tooth and nail to snatch every single vote from the opponents. They have no choice but to resort to making false promises, taking populist stances, appealing to the base emotions of voters, and so on, to win the election. Even the conscientious and principled candidates have no choice but to resort to such techniques. It is completely different in the MARG model. In this model, candidates do not contest against each other. They don't have to fight tooth and nail for the same votes. Each one can develop a Trust Base of one's own, at one's own pace. Since the Trust Base could be spread all across the country, no two candidates have to fight for the vote of the same voters in a specific constituency. Each one would continue in power if they can grow and retain their own base.

26. In the current model, the incumbents are never sure of getting the party ticket and winning the next election. This uncertainty propels them to focus more on the next election than on the people's issues. It propels them to make hay while the sun shines. They cannot take a long-term stand on any issue. Whereas in the MARG model, they can stick to their stand on any issue, and stay in power as long as they can retain the confidence of the Trust Base.

27. In the current model, there is no good mechanism for the leaders to gain feedback on their performance from the voters. Opinion polls, approval ratings, etc., are neither reliable nor conducted regularly. Whereas in the MARG model, the changes in the size of the Trust Bases, which can be monitored daily, like Businesses do their stock prices, serve as instant feedback to the leaders about their performance. They can immediately put efforts like focusing on the issues and re-connecting with the voters if their Trust Bases seem to shrink.

28. In the current model, it is very difficult for candidates who are new or independent, or service-oriented rather than politics-oriented, to win an election, because it is difficult for them to get more votes than the politically-oriented, party-backed candidates. In the MARG model, anyone with leadership qualities and is passionate about an issue or cause, can easily find a Trust Base that exceeds MTB. Thus the MARG model gives more opportunities for the new, independent, and service-oriented leaders to gain power, than the current model.

29. In the current model, voters do not vote for new or independent, or service-oriented candidates because they are afraid that their vote could go 'waste'. In the MARG model, voters can 'keep the old as well as try the new' leaders, by distributing a majority of their twelve votes to the established candidates, and a couple of them to the emerging and alternate leaders. Thus, every leader who can bring some value or other to enough voters will gain power.

Benefits for the Voters

30. In the current model, young people attaining the voting age, i.e., turning eighteen, right after the day of the election, have to wait till the next election, i.e., till the age of twenty-three, to exercise their right to vote for the first time. In the MARG model, there will be no delay for eligible voters. As soon as one attains the voting age, one can register oneself as a voter at an election office, and distribute one's votes to the candidates of one's liking on the very same day.

31. In the current model, people who are away from home for work or business or pleasure or pilgrimage, have to disrupt their plans to come back to their home polling station on the election day to cast their vote or use the postal ballot, which is a cumbersome process and is not available to all. In the MARG model, there are no polling stations or election dates. Voters can redistribute their votes anytime and from anywhere using Mobile App or at an E-Seva center.

32. In the current model, voters who happened to grow up in one state, but happened to migrate to another state because of marriage or job or business, have to come back to their home state to vote or register themselves as voters in the new place. In the MARG model, there are no constituencies and hence the voters are not tied to any one place. They can be anywhere in the country and can distribute their votes to any candidates of their choice. They could choose to distribute a few votes out of their twelve votes to a candidate who hails from their native place and a few votes to another candidate who hails from the place of their residence. This allows the voters to keep an organic connection with their native places as well as become part of the political process in the new place.

33. In the current model, when people migrate from one state to another, they have to register themselves as voters in the new state and it is a cumbersome process. In the MARG model, they have twelve state-level votes, just as they have twelve national-level votes. They can distribute their twelve state-level votes to leaders in their old state or leaders in the new state, or to a mix of them as they like. In other words, the voters decide for themselves, which state they organically feel connected to. There is no additional process they have to go through, to make that decision.

34. In the current model, there is no good solution for the nomadic tribes as they don't have a 'native place' or 'residential address' as all the others do. It is difficult for them to exercise their voting privilege. It is a problem for the voters as well as for the leaders and the Election Commission. This problem is elegantly solved in the MARG model, as anyone can cast their votes to any candidate from anywhere, as long as they have a Voter ID and Aadhaar card.

35. In the current model, we do not have a good solution for Indian citizens who happen to be abroad for various reasons at the time of elections, to vote. The MARG model solves that problem also. They can distribute their votes through Internet or Mobile App or go to the nearby Indian Consulate.

Benefits for the Minorities

36. In the current model, small, poor, and powerless communities hardly have any representation. The current model tries to address this to reserve certain constituencies for SC, ST, and women candidates. This solution, however, is flawed, for two reasons. One, the minority leader from the reserved constituencies cannot be expected to represent the voters of the other majority and minority communities truthfully. Two, the leader cannot represent the minority communities that live in the other constituencies, and thus they are without representation. The MARG model gives a much better, and in fact, an ideal solution to the problem. The minorities of every kind, from all over the country, can form Trust Bases and elect leaders who care about their particular needs and issues. No minority, whose size exceeds MTB goes unrepresented in the MARG model.

Less Expenses, Less Resources and No Disturbances

37. In the current model, candidates, parties, and governments incur huge expenses every five years. Whereas in the MARG model, there are no elections, and hence there are no such huge expenses. There is no deadline to win. Every leader can build up his Trust Base gradually, at his/her own pace, by virtue of his/her deeds, words, and leadership qualities.

38. In the current model, resources are drawn from many government departments during the election season, disrupting their normal function. In the MARG model, with no elections, there is no such need. The election offices can perform their duties all around the year at a uniform pace.

39. In the current model, a candidate is allowed to contest from two constituencies. If the candidate wins both constituencies, he/she has to resign from one of the constituencies and a bye-election needs to be conducted. This is a waste of money and resources, for the candidate, for the party, and for the government as well. In this MARG model, there will be no constituencies, and hence someone contesting from more than one constituency becomes a moot point. Voters from two or more regions of the country can vote for the same candidate if they so wish.

40. In the current model, normal public life gets disrupted in the election season, which sometimes lasts for almost six months before the election. There is no such disruption in the MARG model. Candidates focus on building and retaining their Trust Base all the time, just like Businesses focus on building and retaining their Customer Bases all the time.

41. In the current model, elections would have to be postponed if a natural disaster or pandemic strikes all of a sudden at the time of elections, with implications to everyone. In the new model, no such issue arises as there is nothing like elections, to begin with. The voters can continue to distribute or redistribute their votes, whenever and wherever connectivity is available and wherever e-Seva centers can be opened.

Initial draft: January 26, 2021.
Last updated: January 26, 2022

Author: Krishna Sharma
(themarg.org/krishnasharma)
A Mathematician by training, Information Systems Architect by Profession,
A Philosopher by Nature and a Social Reformer by Passion.

Download the latest version of this document and provide your review at themarg.org