



**Campaign for Electoral Reforms in India  
(CERI)**

**For Proportionate Electoral System**

**Policy Document  
2012**

**Prepared and published by:**

The Campaign for Electoral Reforms in India (CERI)  
REDS Road  
Shanthinagar  
Tumkur 572102  
Karnataka

Email: [ceri.reds@gmail.com](mailto:ceri.reds@gmail.com)  
Website: [www.ceri.in](http://www.ceri.in)  
(0)9845144893

February 2012

---

## INTRODUCTION

Electoral Reforms in India has come to be equated with tinkering with the existing First Past the Post system (FPTP). Quite good efforts are being made to prune the existing systems of all unwanted growth and make it more presentable and acceptable by the general citizens of India. While such endeavours are greatly laudable it is necessary to realize that they fall short of reaching the goals of democratic governance in a country like India. It is common knowledge that India as a country is a complex reality. It is recognized that there are legitimate strains of governing India in the most acceptable way with all the societal foundations of caste, religion, languages and cultures. Simultaneously it must be also recognized that much of the present constraints of governance can be overcome if appropriate systems and structures are put in place at the right time. For example, India arrived at an era of coalition politics long ago and yet we are sticking on to the FPTP system despite sporadic suggestions for ushering in proportional representation system.

In the global scenario, countries that have arrived at coalition politics and that are more concerned about inclusive representation of their citizens in mechanisms of governance have already shifted to proportional representation system. It is significant to note that multicultural societies, irrespective of being in Europe, Africa and Latin America have been spearheading the change to PR system. This is done precisely because such countries have an avowed purpose of ushering in inclusion of indigenous communities, minorities of all kinds, immigrants and women in their representative governance. It is common knowledge that Proportional Representation system enhancing participatory and inclusive democracy also reduces instability, corruption, violence and fascism.

It goes without saying that for a country like India, with all sorts of fundamentalism, casteism, communalism, corruption, violence etc. PR system will be the most appropriate electoral system. Simultaneously we must add a caution that an electoral system is not a panacea for all the problems that country faces. It is only one

but one of the most significant instruments in representative democratic governance.

The Campaign for Electoral Reforms in India (CERI) is convinced that it is high time to have proportional representation system as an electoral system in India. Such a conviction has come about not by any fancied wish but as a consequence of serious researches on the electoral systems of countries that have recognized strengths of inclusive representation and governance. CERI has gathered cross-current thinking and opinions from the India academia, intelligentsia, civil and political leadership and citizens in order to arrive at this conviction. Having been convinced of the deep longing within India for substantive changes in the Indian representation system, CERI decided to bring together as many experts on electoral systems as possible. Top-level experts from different countries put their heads together intensively for three days going often into night discussions and have come out with what is now known as 'Berlin Statement'.

It is time that the issue of representation is taken up in the Parliament of India for serious deliberations. It is heartening to note that the Parliament is already informed by some members of the immediate need to shift to proportional representation system. CERI believes that it is ultimately either the Parliament or the Election Commission of India that will have to take the final call on this very important issue of proportional representation in India. In order to facilitate further deliberations within and outside of the Parliament CERI decided to transform the Berlin Statement into a policy document so that it can lay the foundations for substantive discussions at all levels in India. In the event of the Parliament of India setting up a parliamentary committee to further work on this issue or delegating the responsibility to the Election Commission of India, we are sure this policy document will be an easy tool in their hands.

It is also imperative that the Indian public and political leadership becomes aware of the intricate dimensions of proportional representation so that a mature awareness is arrived at in the course of reforms that the governments may bring about in due course of

time. An informed public is a great asset to any democracy. We wish more and more people begin to discuss the issue threadbare without fear and take up the question of proportional representation in India at all levels.

CERI is highly grateful to all those who have evinced great interest in this cause of democratization of India and in bringing about an inclusive governance in the country. CERI thanks all her state coordinators who have worked assiduously on a voluntary basis despite their other engagements with energy consuming issues. CERI likes to thank in a special way all the experts of electoral systems who gathered in Berlin in order to arrive at objective positions on the most suitable form of proportional representation for India. CERI also thanks all her national and international supporters in carrying this great cause of democracy forward.

**M C Raj**  
Founder - CERI

## **Message from Dr. Arend Lijphart**

**To**

**Workshop of Electoral Systems Experts,  
Berlin, 17-19 October 2011**

"The basic argument is that India is a plural (deeply divided) society and that, like all such societies, it needs elections that have proportional outcomes. Such results can be obtained without PR; in fact, during the time of Congress hegemony, there was a large degree of proportionality because of the inclusiveness of the Congress party. Reserved seats also help. But "proportionality without PR" tends to be imperfect and has lots of other disadvantages (as I state on pp. 39-40 of my 2007 chapter). My advice is that, if you want proportionality in election outcomes, then use PR. I would give this advice to India and all other plural societies. The only further advice I would give, because there are so many forms of PR, choose a PR system that is simple and straightforward. Don't be too much of a PR "perfectionist"! - Arend

Research Professor Emeritus of Political Science  
Department of Political Science, 0521  
University of California, San Diego  
9500 Gilman Drive  
La Jolla, CA 92093-0521, USA

# **Proportional Electoral System for India**

## **A Policy Document**

### **1. Preamble**

India is recognized as one of the largest democracies in the world. From the time of enlightenment democracy has gone through a metamorphosis. One of the latest that is in circulation is about Consociational democracy. Simultaneously different other versions of democracy such as deliberative democracy, dialectic democracy, colonial democracy etc. have been floated in the recent past. India has derived its democracy from the representative model. More and more countries have taken up the task of making their democracies more meaningful to and inclusive of their citizens. One also witnesses concomitantly strenuous efforts by dominant forces to twist democratic institutions to suit their agenda, either hidden or explicit.

One of the essential institutions of representative democracy is electoral system. Nation States, as they have emerged over a period of many centuries can only afford to be governed through a representative system. Different countries of the world have adapted different types of electoral systems to address the representative character of their democracies. It is also recognized by scholars that an electoral system is the democratic institution that may more or less easily be manipulated, dependent on the system chosen. In the postmodern period one witnesses both the efforts being taken at different levels. One set of countries constantly keeps revisiting their electoral system to usher in more inclusive, stable and efficient governance to their citizens. Another set of countries either maintains their electoral system untouched or change it in such a way that it will serve their dominant designs of governance.

India's electoral system has remained largely untouched in the more than 65 years of her post British democratic governance. However,

it must be recognized that different voices have been sounded every now and then towards changing the electoral system of India to make it more inclusive and relevant to the changing needs of time, starting from the very formation of India's constitution. There were prolonged arguments in the Constituent Assembly for and against a proportional electoral system as against the British form of the First Past the Post (FPTP) electoral system. Finally FPTP was adopted in preference to a system of proportional representation (PR) mainly because of the low level of literacy in India. It was assumed that FPTP was comparatively simpler to understand and more pragmatic in a country that had only 15% of literacy at the time of writing the Constitution. At present the rate of literacy in India is estimated to be more than 65%. Subsequently the Indian National Law Commission has made a clear recommendation of the German model of proportional representation electoral system for India in its 1999 report. Every now and then different members of the Parliament of India have been raising the issue of proportional representation as a possible way forward for governance in India without the present levels of corruption, violence, communalism and casteism. The Campaign for Electoral Reforms in India (CERI) has been vigorously spearheading the recent efforts to bring about proportionate electoral system in India in the place of the present FPTP system.

### **2. The Rationale of the Campaign**

Nation Building was and has still been one of the predominant concerns of subsequent governments and civil society actors in the post-British India. In all nation building endeavour two significant dimensions have been stressed. One is external to the nation and is anticipated from beyond the geographical boundaries. The other is internal to the nation. In as much as a nation is internally strong it can also face external threats effectively. Stable governments are necessary prerequisites to meet both these dimensions efficiently. Systems and structures, Instruments and mechanisms of governance are inalienable ingredients in internally building up a nation. The electoral system plays a crucial role in providing stable governments in modern and postmodern nation states. On one hand a plurality based system, which gives the biggest party over-representation

and therefore a 'ruling bonus' may be said to be of support of stable governments. However, in India with the strong role of regional parties this effect is much smaller than in countries like the UK. More important is that a nation state with India's complexity in the composition of its peoples that fails to establish an inclusive democratic governance and a congruent electoral system is bound to be weakened internally and this in turn will inevitably result in governments taking recourse to strong-arm tactics for containing intermittent citizen unrest and protests. Hence the dire need to make sure that inclusive electoral system and subsequently inclusive governance are set up in building up a strong nation. It is such a nation that is internally strong that will be able to face external threats in whatever forms they arrive.

It is recognized that FPTP will make countries develop into a two party democracy since smaller parties will have big problems in winning seats. Some parties with strong local support will, however, be able to take the role of a big party locally and when adding up there may, as the case is in India, be a large variety of parties in parliament. Even in such countries which have a two party system efforts are often being made to usher in proportional representation in order to ensure representation of multiple interest groups. One recognizes that it is a multicultural society, which is in need of very special measures for democratic governance. The complex reality of Indian State makes it difficult even for experts to develop a clear understanding of the undercurrents that guide its destiny. The praxis of the First Past the Post (FPTP) electoral system in India has further accentuated the intricacies of its governance. The international workshop of electoral systems experts, held in Berlin between 17 and 19 of October 2011 recognizes that the FPTP electoral system, vogue in India, is a legacy borrowed from the British. India has come a long way in its political life from the time it got independence from the British. It is now emerging as a major player in the global economic scenario. However, the representative character of its democratic governance leaves much to be desired in terms of the results it produces for more than a billion of its people.

### **3. Mixed Member Proportional System (MMP)**

Politically speaking India has arrived at an era of coalition politics. Being a multicultural society it is only natural that it arrived at an era of coalition politics. One may not see a reversal of this coalition politics in the near future. In this changed scenario India's present electoral system has rendered itself irrelevant. Most of the ills that are consequent to an effort to fit an irrelevant electoral system to a fast changing society are being witnessed in Indian society as well as in Indian mechanisms of governance. India, with its multi-party system and coalition politics is in dire need of changing its electoral system to a more relevant and inclusive representative system that also addresses the needs of coalition politics in a multicultural society.

This workshop of electoral systems experts, after due diligence on complex realities of Indian democratic governance has come to the conclusion that the Mixed Member Proportional Representation System with two votes per voter will address better the changing needs of Indian democracy. It must be recognized that most inclusive democracies in the world have already shifted their electoral system to one or other form of proportionate electoral system. In order to make democracy in such a huge multicultural society as inclusive as possible it is also recommended that India adapted MMP with a ratio of 30% FPTP seats elected from single-member constituencies and 70% party list seats (list PR). The Constitution of India has recommended direct elections to the parliament. It must be noted that list proportional representation system is direct elections with a high degree of accountability if it is implemented according to the spirit and letter of the constitution. Bringing in MMP will not be a total departure from the past electoral praxis in India while at the same time it will integrate to a large extent proportionality in representation. Any democratic transition has to be wrought with extreme caution without completely breaking the past practices. This will continue till the citizens of India are in a position to choose a full PR system.

Mixed Member Proportional Systems are proportional systems

because here all votes in all constituencies are summed up on a higher, usually national, level and then are transformed into parliamentary seats. The List PR vote decides the political composition of all seats in parliament to be in proportion to the votes, not only the 70% of the seats elected under the List PR system. The 70 % of the seats are used as compensatory seats in such a way that a party which is underrepresented in the FPTP part of the election is compensated in the List PR part and the result is fully proportional in the end.

The other feature is that with the List PR component of the election it is much easier to make the parliament truly inclusive with genuine representation of all groups of the society, both without and with particular rules for reservation of seats.

#### 4. Party List System

Reflecting on the most appropriate vote system, which is a significant dimension of any electoral system this workshop of electoral systems experts has arrived at a consensus taking into consideration the predominant view of Indian delegates present that it will be good for India to adopt the two vote system with closed party list as against open party list system. There is an introduction of three significant new dimensions in the electoral system of India.

- ❖ Party List system. This will mean that 70% of the parliamentary seats in India will be elected by the voters casting their votes to a political party of their choice and for a particular candidate. Each political party will prepare a list of its possible candidates as to enter into the parliament in an order of priority. This list will be submitted to the Election Commission of India before every election and will be made known to voters. It will be possible for voters to identify which candidate possibly represents which constituency. Depending on the percentage of votes that a party gains in a given election it will be able to send that many and only that many candidates from its list into the Parliament. Let us assume that there are 1000 members in the Parliament of India. Party A gains 45% of

votes, party B gains 30% of votes. Party C gains 15% of votes and Party D gains 10% of votes. This will give only 450 members in the Parliament to Party A, 300 members to party B, 150 members to party C and 100 members to party D. There will be no bye-election in this system as the next candidate in the party list will go automatically to the Parliament if either a candidate dies or resigns or is expelled from the party.

- ❖ Each voter will have to cast two votes in this MMP system. 30% members to the parliament will be elected through FPTP exactly as it is practiced in India at present. The Election Commission of India will identify such constituencies taking into account all dimensions that determine electoral districts normally in India. All voters can cast their votes to any candidate running in their constituency for one of the 30% seats. The one who gets more votes than other candidates in such constituencies will be declared elected.
- ❖ Voters will also have a second vote, which they can cast to a party of their choice looking at the ideology, policies, programmes laid out in Manifesto, integrity of candidates etc. Depending on the total percentage of votes that a party obtains a corresponding number of candidates will go into the parliament from that party in the full membership of parliament, single member constituencies and List PR seats combined. Totally 70% of parliamentary members will be elected through the second vote of the voters.
- ❖ It is possible that candidates, appearing on the party list may also run for election in that constituency, in which they reside. If such a candidate wins the seat "directly" in his/her constituency he/she will get a seat in parliament in any case, regardless of the rank on which he/she is positioned on the party list. (Example: even if he/she is positioned on rank 100 of the party list and the party is eligible for only 80 seats he/she will get a seat. But consequently only 79 seats according to the ranking-order of the party-list can be distributed. )



- ❖ If e.g. 20 candidates of a particular party win their seat "directly" in their respective constituencies, these 20 seats will be deducted from the total number of seats for which the party is eligible. (Example: if a party is eligible for 80 seats according to the percentage of votes and 20 of their candidates win a "direct seat", only the 60 remaining seats will be distributed according to the ranking on the party-list.)
- ❖ The party list will be a closed list. There are countries that opt for an open list system. Considering the complexities of Indian politics the Workshop of Experts has proposed a closed list system. In an open list system voters are able to give preference votes to candidates and by doing so change the order of the list. For that reason an open list system can't be combined with reservations/quotas. If a country opts to introduce quotas on a party list, it has to be a closed list. A list is considered to be closed the moment it is submitted to the Election Commission and elections are conducted. Parties will have no right to change the order of priority in the list after election results are declared. They will have to follow the order of the list strictly after declaration of election results. In an open list system voters may give individual votes within the lists and that will decide who is filling the party's seats but is regarded as too complicated within an MMP system for India.. This is bound to lead to many types of manipulations by party leadership after elections and voters may not have any say in such post poll decisions of parties.
- ❖ As the ranking of the candidates on the party-list obviously becomes a vital feature in the life and performance of any party, the ranking process should follow democratic principles (inner-party voting)! These processes are vital for the internal party democracy and party governance. The right to nominate the candidates for a particular constituency has to be regulated in the statutes of the parties and should also follow democratic principles.

## 5. Reservation

In principle a List PR system is more inclusive than FPTP even without provisions for reserved seats. This is due to the fact that more votes in a constituency may give a party more seats. Therefore a party will attempt to nominate inclusive candidate lists so that they attract the votes of the Dalits, Women, Adivasis etc. In FPTP having the highest number of votes suffices to win seats, for example when one can win a seat with only 25 % of votes and gaining 35 % of votes does not bring more seats. In list PR every extra vote makes a difference.

However, many countries that in addition to the automatic effect on inclusiveness also built in minimum requirements form inclusiveness into the List PR system in order to make their democracy more inclusive have also integrated one or other form of reservation/separate electorate/separate parliament etc. This workshop of experts on electoral systems deliberated extensively on the question of reservation/separate electorate for Dalits, Adivasis/Tribals, Women and Minorities in the new MMP and took into serious consideration the historical exclusion of these communities of people in many spheres of governance. It is recognized that the present system of reserved seats in the Parliament for SC/ST candidates has a compulsive element of elected members from these categories towing party lines. If such parties happen to be dominant parties it becomes difficult for SC/ST members to truly represent the aspirations of their communities. Also in the present FPTP system people belonging to other categories are allowed to vote for SC/ST candidates. This makes the question of representation of excluded peoples more complex and often impossible given the political compulsions within each party. Such risks are reduced to the minimum in the party list system.

It is well possible to accommodate proportional representation in the party list system under the MMP and this Workshop of Experts recommends that at least the presently given reserved seats will have to be reflected in the list of any party, running in the election. The Parliament of India or the Election Commission of India may decide, according to Indian law, the exact order in the party list in

which names of women, Dalits, Minorities, Adivasis/Tribals etc. have to be placed. Such an order of names in every party list will ensure that a certain percentage of candidates from particular communities or women are elected to the parliament. It must be noted that this is an India specific recommendation taking into account the composition of India's population. In order to ensure maximum representation of communities according to their population in the country it will be necessary not to expand the categories in the party list and keep as less as possible. Simultaneously the Workshop trusts that a healthy competition will emerge between the parties on which of them will take these reservations really seriously and try to be the most inclusive one in the choice of their candidates. The same reservation mechanism as with the party lists could also apply to the candidates running for election in the FPTP constituencies. However, there are more disadvantages since the candidates even in such districts will have to appeal to main stream voters more than when being one out of many candidates on a list. It addition it limits people's right to stand for elections. With MMP one may choose to keep all reservation in the List PR part, but one may also consider continuing the current reservation system. All reservation should only be kept until such time when inclusive representation of hitherto excluded communities becomes a natural reflection through the electoral system.

In the Mixed Member Proportional representation system in India 70% of seats will be filled from party list. It will not be possible for any particular caste groups to claim that a Dalit candidate or a minority candidate won the election because of their votes as it happens in the present FPTP system. In reserved constituencies the dominant caste groups are able to assess the approximate number of votes they cast to Dalit candidates. To that extend they also apply pressure on Dalit members to serve their interests in the post poll scenario thus making a Dalit member an ineffective representative of his own people. In seats that are filled with party list system such a claim is not possible for dominant caste groups. Therefore, Dalit members will be able to represent their people without fear or unnecessary obligations to dominant caste groups.

## 6. Threshold

Threshold refers to a provision in electoral systems to fix a minimum percentage of votes for parties that will make them eligible to enter the parliament. This is not completely new to India. The present Election Commission has recommended more than 5% of votes for a party to be recognized/registered as a national party. In some electoral systems a party will be eligible to send its candidates into the parliament only if it gains a minimum percentage of votes. If a party does not gain the fixed minimum percentage it cannot claim to send representative based on its percentage of votes that will be less than the fixed Threshold.

A widespread healthy democratic practice in most countries with proportionate electoral system is the introduction of 'threshold'. This is done with the avowed purpose of discouraging unhealthy and unnecessary fragmentation of parties as well as to prevent the entry of small groups with very little popular support into parliament of any country. Taking into consideration the need for including legitimate aspirations of small communities of people in India and its large population, it is realized by this workshop of electoral systems experts that for India's MMP a threshold of 1% of overall polled votes or a win of three FPTP seats will be the most appropriate one. In India this may necessitate micro communities to come together and form larger ethnic, linguistic or regional conglomerations among themselves in order to enhance the possibility of their representation in the parliament.

## 7. The Counting System and Distribution of Seats

In order that votes may not be wasted in large proportion, as is the case in the present FPTP system in India, the proportional systems are the most adequate ones. Translating votes into seats, however, plays a significant role in establishing proportionality of representation. There are many counting systems in this process of translating votes cast into seats in representative democracies. To make the translation of votes into seats most accurate, but equally avoiding 'surprise' outcomes, it becomes imperative that the Webster-System be used.



Among the many distribution systems that are available the Webster System also known as Sainte-Laguë Method is chosen mainly because it brings more proportionality in distributing seats based on votes without some random side effects which for example methods like the Largest Remainder have.. The following table will illustrate how votes are distributed as seats. Let us suppose that Party A has obtained a total of 250,000 votes, party B has gained 190,000 votes, party C has gained 120,000 votes and party D only 80,000 votes. Odd numbers are the divisors. First all the votes are divided by number 1. This means all parties gain one seat. As a second step the votes of all parties are divided by number 3. As a third step the votes are further divided by number 5 and this process of division by odd numbers goes on till the total number of seats are allocated. In the table below the division of votes are stopped at the fourth step as there are only a total of ten seats, for example. If there are more seats one or two more rounds of divisions will be necessary. Of the ten seats party A gains four seats while party B gains 3 seats, party C gains 2 seats and party C gains only one seat. The 10th seat has gone to party A as the number of votes is higher than the number of votes that party C has gained even in the second step (only 26,670 as against the 35,710 votes that party A has gained in the fourth step).

Divisor	Party A	Party B	Party C	Party D
1	250000 [1]	190000 [2]	120000 [3]	80000 [5]
3	83333 [4]	63333 [6]	40000 [8]	26666
5	50000 [7]	38000 [9]	24000	16000
7	35714 [10]	27142	17142	11428

The divisors in the first column are simply the odd numbers 1, 3, 5, ... in sequence, as many as are necessary. The numbers in each row are the votes for the party divided by the divisor; the numbers in the brackets are the ranks of these quotients. When the tenth (or however many seats are to be apportioned) highest quotients have been allocated, each party gets as many seats as it has of the

highest numbers. In this case, the parties are assigned 4, 3, 2, and 1 seat in order.

The distribution of seats is done for the full membership of parliament at national level. Thereafter the number of the seats won by FPTP is deducted from each party's number of seats and the rest are distributed to the multi-member constituencies formed by the states according to the votes won by the parties in the states.

## 8. Size of Parliament

It is suggested that the MMP for India has single-member constituencies for the FPTP and that the List PR seats are filled from party lists in each state or combination of states and territories. After the results for the parties are calculated on the basis of nationwide results their seats are filled from such multi-member constituencies. The number of FPTP seats will be less than in the current parliament but with multi-member constituencies for the List PR part there may be a need for increasing the total number of seats in order to make in particular the 30 % single member constituencies meaningful. The reduced number of FPTP seats will necessitate a redistricting of single member constituencies,

The introduction of List PR filled from multi-member constituencies will not only increase the proportionality of representation in terms of parties but will also bring in much better inclusiveness in the Parliament.

It is recognized that even comparatively smaller countries like Germany using MMP and Nepal with its Parallel System, another variant of the mixed system, have more than 600 members in their respective parliaments, for Nepal however, for the temporary constituent assembly only. Introduction of MMP may call for an expansion of the size of the parliament of a country. India, being a huge country of more than one billion people will have to make an expansion of her parliament that will be congruent to the size of its population without undermining the need for manageability and an acceptable relation between representative and voter in the seats allotted through the district votes. Therefore, this workshop of

electoral systems experts likes to recommend to a later Parliamentary Committee of India that we hope will be set up, to consider all possible complex dimensions and arrive at a number that will be proportionally inclusive and professionally manageable. This will also simultaneously call for the empowerment of the Election Commission of India to determine the number of seats per multi-member constituency taking into serious consideration the size and composition of population and the latent diversity of each constituency according to principles defined by law.

## **9. Gerrymandering**

Gerrymandering refers to the manipulative mechanism of governments taking recourse to, from time to time, redefining the boundaries of electoral districts (constituencies). It is not the same as re-districting. Generally ruling parties in some countries indulge in gerrymandering according to the electoral advantages that they want to ensure in the next elections. It is to be noted that gerrymandering is not just a matter of redistricting, which may be necessary after some new census. Gerrymandering is always associated with manipulative redistricting. So there may be a "genuine need" for redistricting but never for gerrymandering. Therefore, this workshop is of the opinion that if there is a genuine need for redistricting, it should be done by the Election Commission, following only technical criteria such as population, size of constituencies, administrative boundaries etc., but never political considerations. However, this problem is practically irrelevant under MMP, as the basis for the number of seats, won by a party will always be distributed according to the number of votes under the party-lists.

## **10. "Extras"**

There are issues that pertain to the FPTP system and have no relevance to PR system and vice versa. However, in view of the fact that various issues were raised during the different State Conferences in India on electoral reforms it is the responsibility of this workshop to take stock of all such issues. This workshop wishes to inform the Indian public that certain issues like negative voting and recall of elected candidates will not have relevance in electoral

politics if the Mixed Member Proportionate system is ushered in India. Experience in countries that have one or other form of proportional representation system has proved over a period of time that larger issues like corruption, violence, communalism are much better contained to the minimum when proportional electoral system is ushered in. However, this Workshop of Experts likes to caution voters that proportional representation election system is not a panacea for all problems that a society faces. There are problems in any society that need to be resolved by mechanisms other than electoral system. Electoral system forms one of the most significant mechanisms of representative democracy. However, it must be noted that there are many other instruments and mechanisms of governance.

## **10.1 Financing of Elections**

This workshop of electoral systems experts is of the view that financing of parties in elections through direct corporate funding will lead to unhealthy practices of democracy and negatively impact governance. In situations specific to India there are communities whose parties may be at a comparative disadvantage to campaign for legitimate success in elections. Therefore, it becomes imperative that State funding of elections is put in place to curb corruption by wealthy parties and to support resource crunched parties. It must be noted that since voters will be casting 70% votes for party list in MMP the unhealthy practice connected to money for individual candidates will be less and party funding will increase transparency. Electoral expenses will be reduced considerably. Corruption as one witnesses at the time of elections increases when the onus of spending for campaign is shifted to individual candidates. In a party list system there will be a need to increase the percentage of a party vote and not to gain edge over a particular candidate, at least in 70% of the seats.

The Election Commission of India will have the authority to decide on necessary criteria for approving electoral expenses of eligible parties.

## **10.2 Internal Party Democracy**

This workshop took into serious consideration that in a democracy, parties should have utmost freedom of how they want to conduct the affairs of their party without the government exercising much normative control. However, taking into serious consideration the existence of feudalism, nepotism and tendencies to perpetuate dynastic control over parties, this workshop also highlights the utmost importance of ensuring inner party democracy in every electoral system, be it FPTP or PR system. One may cite as an example the mechanisms of preparing the party list prior to submitting it to the election commission. The Election Commission of India may draw out basic criteria of internal party democracy for preparing the party list. If the preparation of party lists are not based on the criteria evolved by the Election Commission it may be necessary that the Election Commission demand a party to prepare the party list once again. The same mechanism may be applied to other aspects of electoral processes.

## **10.3 Direct Democracy**

Direct democracy refers to a mechanism in which citizens make decisions directly without going through elected representatives. Any vibrant democracy will take recourse to mechanisms of direct democracy. However, in the modern and postmodern nation states direct democracy is not easily possible given the type of complex realities of the nation state politics. This workshop realizes that the question of direct democracy is fast spreading in many countries of the world and India will have to face it sooner than later but as of now it is not an immediate need to add to the already ambitious shift from FPTP to MMP. However, It will be important to think of how some elements of direct democracy can be combined with the MMP system in the course of time.

## **10.4. Bicameral Parliament**

Bicameral Parliament refers to a parliamentary system that has two houses, usually one Upper House and one Lower House. This

workshop takes note of the serious nature of the bicameral parliament as it exists in India. However, it desists from delving deep into this question in this workshop, as this is more of a Nation State subject and not an electoral system subject. We respect the wisdom of the Indian State to deal with this issue.

## **10.5. Pre-poll or Post-poll Alliance**

This is a very difficult question to be determined by any group or institution. The essential principle of electoral system is that voters must know what type of coalition will be in place in order to exercise their electoral choice. It will not be truly democratic if a coalition is set up after elections against the will of voters. It will be very difficult to also assess the choice of voters of a party after the poll results are declared. Therefore, in principle it looks better that pre-poll alliances are made in the best interest of voter choice. However, it must be noted that a proportional electoral system may also necessitate the compulsion of post-poll coalitions in order to form lasting governments. This Workshop of electoral systems experts is of the opinion that there cannot be any hard and fast rule of what type of coalition should exist in a democracy. Political parties should have the liberty to determine the type of coalitions that they want to make. It is best left to parties either to elicit the consensus of members of their parties for a possible pre-poll alliance or to convince members of their parties of the compulsions that lead to a post-poll alliance. The voters should know the alternatives at hand when they cast their vote even if there are situations where pre-poll alliance is not possible.

## **11. Other Related Issues**

This workshop of experts on electoral systems dealt with certain specific issues taking into account the Indian situation and arrived at a consensus in the following manner. These issues have been taken up mainly because they are the consequence of the voice of the people who participated in different state conference in India on electoral reforms organized by CERI.

**11.1 Voting age:** This workshop insists on the need for making the youth take part in electoral practices at an early age. However, the present praxis of 18 years as voting age is a universally accepted principle and there is no reason to change it as of now. However, this workshop is of the strong opinion that there should be no disparity between the eligibility criteria for voting and contesting. The eligibility for voting and for contesting should be same.

**11.2 One Day Poll:** There are countries that conduct their elections for more than a day. In such cases voters have the freedom to cast their votes in any one the assigned days. This workshop of experts is of the firm view that the present practice of polling on one day is an appropriate one for India. However, it recommends counting of votes at the earliest possible time after the voting day without efforts to prolong the counting of votes.

**11.3 Electronic or Paper Voting:** This workshop of experts on electoral systems is of the view that even if electronic voting system is in place one may consider systems where a paper trail is kept in a physical ballot box to facilitate alternative manual control counts. in place. The Election Commission of India can consider the complicities related to this aspect and make appropriate decision according to its wisdom based on ground realities.

**11.4 Compulsory Voting:** This workshop of electoral systems experts sets aside any recommendation on the issue of compulsory voting, as it is more an ideological and political question than a question of electoral procedures. The workshop is, however, of the opinion that the MMP itself will lead to more participation and thus a high level of polling.

This workshop of experts has agreed that despite differences of opinion on certain issues among experts, consensus has been reached on all the above listed dimensions of electoral systems that will be tailor-made for India.

## Experts and Delegates

The following are the experts and delegates in the workshop of electoral systems experts held in Berlin, Germany from 17 to 19 October 2011.

01. Dr. Arshi Khan - India, **Associate Professor** (Since September 2009) Department of Political Science, Aligar Muslim University, Aligarh-202002, State of Uttar Pradesh, India.

Area Specialisation

### **Conflict Resolution, Peace and Federal Governance in Multicultural Societies**

Federalism, Regional Autonomy and Minority Rights--Major Issue related to Federalism in a Multicultural Society with special reference to India-- Union-State Relations, Party Politics, Coalition Politics, Rights for Minorities and Deprived Sections, Autonomy and Special Status for Regions, Constitutional Reforms, Constituent Assembly Debates, and Impact of Identity Consciousness on the Working of the Establishment and Nation Building in India.

#### **02. Prof. Dr. Joachim Behnke - Germany**

Professor Dr. Joachim Behnke was appointed at the Zeppelin University (ZU) to the chair of political science. Behnke comes from the Ludwig-Maximilians-University Munich, where he was last a professorship for Empirical Policy Research and Policy Analysis. At the beginning of the spring semester, he started work.

Doctorate after studying theatre arts, philosophy, communication studies, economics and political science at the Ludwig-Maximilian University in Munich and habilitated Behnke at the Otto-Friedrich-University Bamberg. His research interests lie in the choice of subject systems, voter behaviour, Empirical value research, modern political theory, game theory and public choice theory and empirical methods and science.

#### **03. Dr. Ron de Jong - The Netherlands**

Researcher Kiesraad (Electoral Council). Conducting research on behalf of the Electoral Council. Runs a database on Dutch election results 1848-2011 ([www.verkiezingsuitslagen.nl](http://www.verkiezingsuitslagen.nl)) and published in 2011 an Electoral atlas of the Netherlands 1848-2010

04. Prof. Fuchs, Martin - Germany

05. Mr. Hahn, Walter - Germany

Joined the Public Relation Department of "Bread for the World" in August 1984, the development agency of the Protestant Churches of Germany, informing the donors about the supported projects. From 1988 until 2002 active as project officer for the projects supported in South India (Andhra Pradesh) - most of these projects had at least a specific Dalit component or were exclusively geared to Dalit-issues ; taking over the special responsibility for Dalit empowerment policy of the organization in 1997. Founding member of the "International Dalit Solidarity Network", which was constituted in March 2000 and active in its steering-group until 2005; now member of the IDS-N-Council. Initiated the formation of the platform "Dalit Solidarity in Germany", which finally came into being in May 2001 and bringing together ca. 80 organisations, one-world-groups and individuals. Since 2002 working as its coordinator

06. Mr. Y L Jayaraj - India, Consultant

Jayaraj is actively engaged with the Voluntary Sector for the past 34 years from grassroots to international levels. He is the principal consultant of Atma Consultancy Services and champions the cause of justice and democracy with marginalized communities. He has a special emphasis on affirmative action for strengthening mass movements and institutions in their empowerment and sustainable development.



07. Mr. Jeroninio Almeida, India, iCONGO

Jeroninio Almeida is a Management Consultant/ Professional Trainer & Mentor Coach (Leadership, Neuro Linguistic Programming (NLP), Enneagram, Performance Coaching, Organisation Development, Developing Human Potential & Personal Effectiveness, CSR, Social Entrepreneurship, Sales , Marketing & Communications) , Motivational Speaker, Social Entrepreneur, Business/Marketing Strategist, Curator & Promoter of big ticket Charity Events & Knowledge Forums, Social Development Worker , Writer, Fundraiser, Philanthropist & Just Another Volunteer. He also speaks at various forums and coaches senior executives in blue chip companies & bilateral/multilateral organisations like the UN in India and overseas. He is also a board member on the UNV national committee formed by UNDP & the ministry of sports and youth affairs to promote volunteerism in India and on the advisory panel of the National Foundation for Communal Harmony promoted by the Ministry of Home Affairs to promote secularism, peace and communal harmony.

He is also the founder of the International Confederation of NGOs ([www.icongo.in](http://www.icongo.in)) and the person who conceptualized & pioneered movements with the UN and other partners like the JOY OF GIVING, RIGHT EVERY WRONG, KARMAVEER awards and KARMAYUGA in India with an intent to create attitudinal & behavioral change in people for encouraging citizen action for social justice. He is also a much sought after high energy keynote & motivational speaker and has spoken in forums organised by the UN, World Economic Forum, Rotary International, ISB, World Affairs Council and various other prestigious institutions and universities. He is also an Executive Coach to various CEOs, a veteran politician in Goa and 2 young parliamentarians in Delhi. Jerry through the RIGHT every WRONG movement also pioneered the thought leadership for the fight against corruption and electoral reforms in India with former Chief Election

Commissioners like Mr. James Michael Lyngdoh and Mr. Krishnamurthy.

08. Mrs. Jyothiraj - India

A post graduate in sociology and a Diploma holder in Human resource Management, she is the founder of the Rural Education for Development Society together with her husband M C Raj. She has co-authored some books. Functions as the Director of REDS and is one of the founding members of CERI. She is the Co-Founder of the Dalit Panchayat Movement and Booshakthi Kendra in Karnataka, India.

09. Mr. Khorrum Omer - India, National Secretary, Indian Muslim League Party

10. Prof. Krishna Khanal - Nepal.

Prof Krishna P Khanal holds Master's Degree from the Tribhuvan University, Nepal. Currently he is a Professor of Political Science at Tribhuvan university and is teaching in the Central Department of Political Science, Tribhuvan University (Kathmandu) for more than 30 years. Prof. Khanal has extensively written in contemporary politics of Nepal and engaged in public discourse nationwide. His latest publications include Nepal's Discourses on Constituent Assembly (2005), Restructuring the State (in Nepali, 2008), He has edited Federalism in our Nepal -Execution and Management (in Nepali, 2008).

11. Dr. Krishna Swamy Dara - India

12. Mrs. Moll, Ursula - Germany, Bread for the World

13. Mr. Muller, Philip - Germany

Philip Muller is a social worker and lecturer in Germany. He is a lecturer in Frankfurt University of Applied Sciences. He is involved in Dalits. One of the founding members of the Dalit Solidarity

Platform, Germany, he is the treasurer of DSP. He regularly organizes exchange programmes with Dalit groups in India.

14. Dr. Nepia, Gaylene Huia - New Zealand

15. Prof. Dr. v. Prittwitz, Volker, Germany.

Prof. Dr. von Prittwitz studied History, Sociology, and Political Science in Regensburg und Berlin. Since 1991, he held contemporary chairs for Political Science in the Universities of Darmstadt, Hamburg, Erlangen, and Erfurt, and he became associated professor for Political Science at the Freie Universität Berlin in 2004. Among his publications are the books: *Umweltaußenpolitik* (1984: Theoretical and empirical aspects of environmental diplomacy), *Das Katastrophenparadox. Elemente einer Theorie der Umweltpolitik* (1990: Theoretical foundations of environmental policy), *Politikanalyse* (1994: How to analyze politics?), *Verhandeln und Argumentieren* (Ed. 1996: Bargaining and arguing), *Vergleichende Politikanalyse* (2007: Comparative Politics). Since 2008, he gave lectures in Finnland, Dakhla/ Bangla Desh and Seoul/Korea. Short stay as Visiting Researcher at ESPI in March 2011. More info: [www.volkervonprittwitz.de](http://www.volkervonprittwitz.de)

16. Mr. M C Raj - India

Holds degrees in philosophy and another in theology. Founder of the Rural Education for Development Society, The Dalit Panchayat Movement and the Booshakthi Kendra in Karnataka, India! Did research on the electoral systems of Germany, Norway, New Zealand, Nepal and the Netherlands. A prolific author of more than 17 books. Usually writes on philosophy, psychology and spirituality. Of late has become a fiction writer. As a consequence of his researches he founded and spearheads the present national Campaign for Electoral Reforms in India (CERI).

17. Mr. D Raja - India

Mr. D. Raja CPI. July 2007 Elected to Rajya Sabha Aug. 2007-May 2009 Member, Committee on Science and Technology, Environment and Forests Member, Consultative Committee for the Ministry of Human Resource Development May 2008 onwards Member, Joint Parliamentary Committee on Security Matters in Parliament House Complex Member, Committee on Rules June 2008 onwards Member, General Purposes Committee July 2008-May 2009 and Jan. 2010 onwards Member, Parliamentary Forum on Global Warming and Climate Change July 2009 onwards Member, Committee on Ethics Aug. 2009 onwards Member, Committee on Home Affairs Member, Committee on the Welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Member, Consultative Committee for the Ministry of External Affairs Permanent Special Invitee, Consultative Committee for the Ministry of Human Resource Development Oct. 2009 onwards Member, Joint Committee on Food Management in Parliament House Complex Dec. 2009 onwards Member, Select Committee to examine the Commercial Division of High Courts Bill, 2009 Nov. 2010 onwards Member, Committee on Member of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS)

18. Mr. Rayalu Yugalkishore - India

H o D at Dharampeth Science College, Nagpur

DEE, DDE, AMIE, M.A.(Eng. Litt.) MBA (HRM), Engineering, English Literature, Human Resource Development. Received Maharashtra State Best Teacher Award - 2011. Attended India - Vietnam festival at Hanoi, Vietnam. Presented Paper at International Solidarity Convention, Laos. Presented paper at Cairo Conference on Solidarity. President -Maharashtra Vocational Teachers Association. V.President - All India Peace & Solidarity Organization, Nagpur Unit. V. President - Centre for Cultural, Educational Environmental and Social Studies. Secretary - All India Progressive Forum

19. Mr. Scheltens, Jerome - The Netherlands

Jerome studied political science (University of Amsterdam and New York University) specializing in elections, electoral systems and media use of opinion polls in election campaign periods. Jerome also shortly worked as an political editor and coordinator at the Dutch broadcasting company KRO and at the Netherlands Government Information Service (RVD) of the Ministry of General Affairs, the Prime minister's ministry. Since 1998 Jerome has been involved in many projects at the Dutch Prodemos, House for Democracy and the Rule of Law, the former Institute for Political Participation (IPP). Jerome started his work for NIMD in August 2011 (Netherlands Institute for Multiparty Democracy). At NIMD Jerome is responsible for the programmes in Tanzania and Tunisia.

20. Mrs. Sukanya Natarajan - Visitor Delegate from India

21. Mr. Vivek Sakpal - India.

An Engineering graduate he is the Coordinator of CERI together with M C Raj

22. Dr. Voll, Klaus - Germany

23. Mr. Vollan, Kåre - Norway

A Norwegian citizen is an internationally acclaimed expert in electoral systems and processes. He has undertaken a lot of advisory works on elections and elective systems across the globe. He has been involved in elections since 1990 when Eastern Europe opened up. He has visited Nepal a large number of times since 2006 and was involved here in the discussions of electoral systems and worked with the Election Commission to make operational details of Constituent Assembly elections based upon the Interim Constitution. He has also advised on elections and electoral processes in many countries like CIS countries of Eastern Europe as well as

Palestine and Guyana. He was head of elections in Bosnia and Herzegovina and was in charge of organizing two elections there. He is also currently working in Zimbabwe and Armenia apart from Nepal. Mr Vollar was interviewed by MIREST Nepal at Godavari Village Resort in Lalitpur on July 09, 2009, while he was attending a workshop on electoral systems organized by Election Commission of Nepal.

24. Dr. Wagner, Christian - Germany

25. Mr. Wiek, Hans-Georg - Germany

Dr. Hans-Georg Wiek, Ambassador (ret.) German Ambassador to India 1990-1993; Chairman of German - Indian Society 1996 - 2008; since then Honorary Chairman of German Indian Society."

## **Towards Proportional Representation in India**

### **A Little History**

Right from the time of India's independence sporadic efforts have been made to reform the FPTP electoral system of India and usher in proportional representation system. Even before the present Constitution of India came into effect there were extensive debates in the Constituent Assembly on both the British model of FPTP and the Single Transferrable Vote of the PR system. The following were the arguments for proportional representation system for India.

### **Constituent Assembly Deliberations**

The effort for an inclusive democratic governance continued in the Independent India through many deliberations in the Constituent Assembly. Mahboob Ali Baig Sahib Bahadur and Kazi Syed Karimuddin are the two Muslim leaders who seethed for PR system.

Mahboob Ali Baig Sahib Bahadur says the following:

"One of the best safeguards for minority rights and interests is the system of election by proportional representation with the STV, which has already been adopted in a large number of countries..."

"...Therefore, this method of election represents the expression of the people's will and it will be more stable and responsible. My submission is that all the fears that some people might entertain that this method of election would involve the country in sections and it will go against the solidarity of the country are false. Some people who are really communally minded smell a rat in anything in regard to this kind of representation, that is unjustifiable. This is the most scientific and more democratic method of representing the people of a country in a democratic system of government."

### **Kazi Syed Karimuddin asserts:**

"The common (FPTP) system of representation perpetuates the danger and the only remedy is proportional representation. That system is also profoundly democratic for it increases the influence

of thousands of those who would have no voice in the government and it brings men more near on equality by so contriving that no vote shall be wasted and that every vote shall contribute to bring into parliament a member of his own choice and opinion"

"The present electoral system is really perverse"

"Today we are faced with an electoral system in which there is no guarantee except the reservation of seats that has been embodied in article 292 and 293. By my amendment I plead that if proportional representation is guaranteed the reservation of seats even on religious grounds must go."

"The system that I regard as the best is the system of PR. It is not based on religious grounds and it applies to all minorities."

"In my opinion, where there is heterogeneous population it is very necessary that we should have coalition governments. It will not be a bad thing that various representative elements should have to be consulted in forming a ministry"

### **National Law Commission**

The National Law Commission of India took cognizance of the need for reforming India's electoral system and making it more inclusive. The endeavour started in November 1995 when the Ministry Law, Justice and Company Affairs asked the Law Commission to look into the many pending election petitions. In August 1998 the Law Commission undertook a thorough review of the Representation of the Peoples Act, 1951. Between 14 November 1998 and 24 January 1999 it organized four national seminars to elicit public opinion on the same subject. The National Law Commission finally came out with a clear recommendation for a Proportionate Electoral System largely based on the German model but making it fit into Indian ground realities.

"With a view to rectifying and redressing the aforementioned distortions and inequities, the Law Commission was of the provisional opinion that introducing a List System may serve to redress the

aforementioned distortions, at least to a partial extent. For this purpose, we looked to the electoral system obtaining in certain other countries including Germany where a mixed system (FPTP and list system) is in force. In Germany, part of the seats are filled on the basis of FPTP system where under the members are elected from territorial constituencies and the remaining members are chosen from the lists put forward by the political parties. We did not however, think it advisable to import the German system whole-hog for it was found to be extremely complicated and difficult of operation in a country like ours where a sizeable chunk of population is illiterate and is not able to operate such a complicated electoral system.

Accordingly, it was suggested that in the Lok Sabha as well as in the State Legislative Assemblies, the present strength should be increased by 25% of the existing strength which increased strength should be filled on the basis of list system. The list system was to be confined only to recognized political parties (RPP). There would be no separate vote, nor a separate election for the members to be chosen under the list system."

In between the first and the latest efforts there have been many endeavors to bring in proportional representation system in India.

Already in 1930, Jawaharlal Nehru argued for proportionate electoral system. "...the only rational and just way of meeting the fears and claims of various communities ..." "...we have no doubt ...that proportional representation will in future be the solution of our problem" (Jawaharlal Nehru, 'Note on Minority', Young India, 15 May 1930)

In 1974 Mr Jayaprakash Narayan appointed the Tharkunde Committee to look at electoral reforms and Justice V M Tharkunde recommended proportionate electoral system for India based on the German model of MMP.

In the year 2003 Mr. G M Banathwala of the Indian Muslim League Party moved a Private Member's Constitution Amendment Bill in the Parliament demanding proportional representation in India. This was

vehemently opposed by the BJP. (The Hindu, New Delhi: July 25, 2003)

In the year 2008, the Campaign for Electoral Reforms in India (CERI) was initiated with an explicit purpose of working towards proportionate electoral system in India.

When the present dispensation came into effect in 2009 one of the first things to be raised in the parliament was a call for proportionate electoral system by Mr. Sitaram Yechury of the Communist Party of India (Marxist). This was assiduously followed by also the CPI through Mr. D Raja. He argued that proportional representation would effectively resolve the issues of corruption and violence in India.



## Campaign for Electoral Reforms in India (CERI)

### The Path Traversed

The Campaign for Electoral Reforms in India was launched in October 2008 after having seriously considered the non-representative and non-participatory nature of the First Past The Post electoral system that is in vogue in India. Power as participation should lead to participatory democracy. Unfortunately the Indian electoral system denies to a large extent not only participation but also genuine inclusion to many sections of Indian population. While exploring the possibilities of embellishing Indian democratic governance with principles and policies of inclusive representation it was decided to take up researches in countries that have reformed their electoral systems. There are countries that are serious about giving inclusive representation to their cities. In this effort some of them have made special provisions to enhance the representation of communities in their countries that are ill equipped for historical reasons. The German Dalit Solidarity Platform was a big supporter in these researches and subsequent explorations.

1. A Research was taken up by M C Raj on the German Electoral System and as a consequence the book Dalitocracy, Theory and Praxis of Dalit Politics was published and has been widely distributed for general education. It did not stop with being a book but stimulated a lot of discussion in many circles on the need for reexamining the Indian Majoritarian Electoral System.
2. It was decided to launch a Campaign to bring about proportionate electoral system and the launching took place in Dhaka in an International Conference in October 2008. In this launching Conference a Core Group of CERI was set up with State Coordinators from 15 States.

3. The International Conference was followed up by a National Conference in Delhi where interested people from different parts of India took part. Participants from Nepal along with their present Chief Election Commissioner placed a formal request to CERI to start a chapter of CERI in Nepal and also organize an International Conference in Kathmandu in view of the urgency for integrating the Proportionate Electoral System into the new Constitution of Nepal.
4. Subsequently seventeen State Conferences and innumerable District level Conferences have taken place all over India.
5. The Communist Party of India has officially declared its support to CERI in the State Conference of Tamilnadu. Greater assertions from the Left parties have come for the Proportionate Electoral System in India. CERI team has had official negotiations with the top guys in CPI and subsequently Mr. D. Raja one of the general secretaries of CPI raised the issue of Proportionate Electoral System in the Upper House of India's Parliament.
6. Many Intellectuals from North Eastern States have started openly saying that Proportionate Electoral System may be the only solution to the stalemate in democratic functioning in their region. Assam, Tripura, Manipur, Sikkim and Mizoram have already organized State Conferences.
7. The Core Group of CERI has been meeting regularly and has planned out national programmes gradually also increasing its ownership level. It is a great measure of commitment that the original Coordinators of CERI still remain as Coordinators on a voluntary basis and new ones have joined for new States. Besides the Coordinators a lot of others have joined hands in all the States to promote PR system in India.
8. Three Training of Trainers have taken place, one at the national level and other two for Maharashtra and Tamilnadu cadre of the Campaign. CERI is now also training scholars from all over the country in order to equip the intellectual resource base of the campaign.

9. In order to broaden the horizon and scope of CERI it was also decided to look at other existing variants of the Proportionate Electoral System. Researches were taken up in Norway, New Zealand, Nepal and the Netherlands.
10. These researches led to the realization that indigenous peoples for whom many countries have made special provisions in their electoral laws must be brought together to reflect on inclusive governance of the world. Such aspirations and planning ultimately led to the historic first ever Round Table of the World Parliament of Indigenous Peoples. This took place in January 2011 at the Booshakthi Kendra in Tumkur. 39 delegates from 10 countries attended it.
11. The Core Group of CERI spent three intensive days in discussions to prepare the Manifesto and also to develop gelling mechanisms to develop collective ownership of the Campaign. All are happy about the utter seriousness with which the Core Group worked and ended with a strategic plan for the future work of the Campaign.
12. There is also happiness that in such a short time CERI Nepal (CERiN) has been launched with active support from the Chief Election Commissioner of Nepal and many members of the Constituent Assembly and of the Parliament of Nepal.
13. As of now the Campaign has stepped into 22 States of India with also a huge signature campaign for electoral reforms to collect signatures across the country. The London School of Economics is in constant touch with the efforts of CERI.
14. In an endeavor to enter the corridors of the Parliament of India with proposals for electoral reforms in India and to bring about proportional representation system, it was decided to bring together as many top-level experts of the world on electoral systems. The aim of organizing such a Workshop of Experts was to place a substantial policy document in the hands of parliamentarians as they begin to move a bill in the parliament. The Workshop of Electoral Systems experts was organized in Berlin from 17 to 19 October

2011. Experts from different countries assembled for three full days and as a result CERI has come out with this policy document.

15. CERI is very happy that in such a short time of its campaign the issue of Proportionate Electoral System has been explicitly voiced in the Rajya Sabha by Comrade D. Raja in the debates on corruption as a way of containing many difficulties in governance including corruption. CERI is happy that the All India Progressive Forum has taken serious note of the dire need for electoral reforms in India to bring about proportional representation system. CERI is more than willing to join hands with any progressive individuals and groups that are genuinely concerned about greater democratization of India and about ushering in more and more inclusive governance.

There is every reason to believe that this Campaign for Electoral Reforms in India will be carried forward by all and sundry in the future and the tasks of CERI will be considerably reduced as we move along.