



भारतीय प्रबंध संस्थान बेंगलूर  
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT  
BANGALORE

**WORKING PAPER NO: 436**

**Towards the De-Criminalization of Elections and Politics**

**Trilochan Sastry**

*Professor*

*Quantitative Methods & Information Systems*

*Indian Institute of Management Bangalore*

*Bannerghatta Road, Bangalore – 5600 76*

*Ph: 080-2699 3285*

[trilochans@iimb.ernet.in](mailto:trilochans@iimb.ernet.in)

Year of Publication-November 2013

## **Towards the De-Criminalization of Elections and Politics<sup>1</sup>**

*Democracy disciplined and enlightened is the finest thing in the world. A democracy prejudiced, ignorant, superstitious, will land itself in chaos.*

*- M.K. Gandhi*

### **Abstract**

We study the role of crime and money in elections and politics in the context of several recent far reaching judgments of the Supreme Court and the Central Information Commission. Based on publicly available data of over 62,800 candidates who contested National and State Assembly elections from 2004 to 2013, we show that both crime and money play an important role in winning elections. Thus average assets go up from Rs.1.37 crore per candidate to Rs.2.03 crores for third place candidates, Rs.2.47 crores for runners up, Rs.3.8 crore for winners, Rs.4.27 crore for winners with some criminal record, and Rs.4.4 crore for winners with serious criminal records. About 30% of elected representatives in Lok Sabha and State Assemblies have criminal cases against them. Similarly, while only 12% of ‘clean’ candidates without any criminal record win, 23% of those with a criminal record, and again, 23% of those with serious criminal records win. Several candidates and winners have multiple cases, and on average there is 1 serious case for every 5 candidates and 1 for every 2 winners. Women candidates and representatives clearly show a much lower level of criminal records. With rising inequality, proliferation of political parties leading to winners with smaller percentages of the votes, and the role of big money in elections, votes can be easily ‘bought’. We end with some tentative recommendations for improving the situation. These include legal, and administrative changes, and the role that civil society and voters can play. We look at options of moving beyond the current first past the post ‘British’ system to other systems including the American Presidential system, the European proportional representation system, the French style run-off elections and the Japanese system of multi member constituencies. Immediate electoral political considerations might promote ad hoc changes that would lead us astray. A long public debate and discussion is needed to try and evolve a reasonable consensus.

**Keywords:** Election, Politics, Criminalization, Democracy

---

<sup>1</sup> Nishank Varshney, Nilesh Ekka and K.Srinivasulu assisted in the data analysis

## **Introduction and Context**

The Supreme Court has recently given several Judgments on electoral and political reforms in response to various public interest litigations (PILs). These include disqualification of convicted MPs and MLAs[1], barring those in jail from contesting (now reversed by Parliament) [2], and directing the EC to bring the issue of election related ‘freebies’ under the ambit of the Code of Conduct [3]. The Cabinet decided to pass an Ordinance to nullify the disqualification of convicted MLAs and MPs, but reversed its decision when a political leader publicly opposed it. A recent Court ruling said that returning officers should reject nomination papers of candidates who do not provide all relevant information on their assets, liabilities, and criminal cases if any [4]. This strengthened an earlier ruling asking candidates to declare their financial, criminal and educational background. While earlier the Court had said that returning officers could not reject nomination papers that contain ‘false’ information, this judgment says that incomplete or blank affidavits can be rejected. The Supreme Court also ruled that voters should have the option of “None of the above (NOTA)” on the Electronic Voting Machines (EVMs) to ensure privacy for those who don’t find any candidate suitable [5]. The Central Information Commission declared political parties as public authorities under the Right to Information (RTI) Act which has become a matter of public debate [6]. An earlier Judgment of the Supreme Court in 2001 barred a former Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu from contesting elections even though she had got a stay from the High Court [7]. This effectively barred all such convicted candidates.

Two petitions on illegal foreign funding of political parties and on paid news during elections are pending. Most of these petitions can be traced to a 2002 Judgment of the Supreme Court in response to a petition by the Association for Democratic Reforms (ADR) mandating disclosure of candidates’ financial, educational and criminal background if any [8]. As information and analysis of candidates and winners became public, more and more petitions were filed.

In all cases, the political parties have come together and tried to undo the judgments and rulings. These include the attempt to overturn the 2002 Judgment on the ADR petition through an Amendment to the Representation of People (RP) Act. This Amendment was later struck down as unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. The RP Act was amended to allow jailed persons to contest to overturn the Supreme Court’s judgment. An Ordinance to overturn the judgment disqualifying convicted MPS and MLAs was almost passed and halted only when there was opposition from a political leader. There are serious attempts to overturn the CIC ruling bringing political parties under RTI. Parliament wants the current system to continue, while civil society and citizens at large want a change.

Inaction is sometimes more eloquent than action. The reluctance to tackle corruption, trying to ignore and undermine the Comptroller and Accountant General (CAG) which is a Constitutional Authority, and withholding sanction to prosecute Ministers involved in the Commonwealth

Games, 2G, KG and Coalgate scams, reveal the nature of the current political system. The movement for a Lok Pal Bill has also been opposed by the political system by masterly inaction. While there may be several views on what kind of Lok Pal Bill is needed, everyone agrees that we need to eliminate corruption. So we have swift action to overturn or nullify decisions and reports of Constitutional Authorities like the Supreme Court, the CIC, and the CAG. On the other hand, there is complete inaction on issues of corruption and big scams.

These events raise several questions. Why are we in this situation? What can be done about it? What are the powers of Parliament and the Courts? What is the recourse if Parliament passes laws that are against public interest? Do we need to change the electoral and political system? These are larger questions. They would require separate studies and analysis. We examine here only the limited issue of the criminalization of elections and politics – the use and misuse of money and muscle power in elections.

De-criminalization of Indian politics captures public imagination. A recent survey shows that a vast majority of Indians, about 98 per cent, want criminals out of Parliament and Assemblies<sup>2</sup>. On the other hand, expert analysis and informed opinion usually dives deeper into the root causes and seeks solutions therein. But political parties ultimately react only to public pressure. The ‘demand’ side therefore also needs to be addressed to bring about change. There is a key difference between the outlook of the political establishment and that of scholars and analysts. The former are very concerned about how public opinion will affect their electoral fortunes, the latter are not. As a result, we see the political establishment opposing civil society efforts, Court judgments and CIC rulings, whereas, many scholars and analysts see these efforts as irrelevant, incomplete or even as counterproductive.

### **Research on Criminalization**

Ever since data became public, a large volume of research emerged, which is impossible to cite completely. A paper by G.T. Haokip [9] traces this problem to a lack of ethics in politics and to autocratic political party leaders. D. Tiwari [10] argues that governance will not improve merely with cleaner candidates and representatives, and a lot more needs to be done. S. Chauchard [11] says that as long as we have bad governance, politics will be governed by ethnic identities which will lead to voters preferring tainted candidates who can dole out patronage. M. Vaishnav [12, 13] concludes that voters prefer tainted candidates who are seen as powerful and can ensure some access to Government services and jobs. He recommends political party reforms and greater voter awareness. B. Panda [14] has a set of recommendations based on strengthening the law. M. Godbole [15] recommends more information to voters in the absence of political will to reform the system. C. Jaffrelot’s book [16] examines in some detail the cause of the problem and

---

<sup>2</sup> Business Line- Avaaz Survey, September 6, 2013 “98% Indians want criminals to stay out of Parliament: Avaaz survey”

attributes its genesis to the emergency. M. I. Minch [17] describes the ground level situation and recommends greater voter awareness led by civil society organizations. E. Sridharan [18] examines an important aspect of de-criminalizing politics, namely funding elections, and recommends public funding. M. V. Rajeev Gowda and E. Sridharan [19] recommend partial public funding to overcome the problem of black money in elections. J. S. Chhokar [20], [21] argues for a greater involvement of citizens in electoral reforms. T. Sastry [22], [23] examines the role of civil society in electoral reforms and describes some breakthroughs as well as argues for greater transparency as the first step towards changing the system. Much of the literature goes into depth on some aspects of electoral reforms. Most of them suggest administrative, legal and structural reforms, and only a few touch upon raising voter awareness.

### **Overview of situation from 2004 to date**

The analysis that follows is based on the sworn affidavits submitted by candidates to the Election Commission of India prior to contesting elections. This was the outcome of two Supreme Court Judgments in 2002 and 2003 based on a PIL filed by ADR. The latter petition was also filed by PUCL, Lok Satta and several other organizations. The Supreme Court mandated disclosure of cases where charges had been framed<sup>3</sup> against a candidate and where conviction would lead to a sentence of 2 years or more. To prevent malicious or motivated cases by rivals, the Court limited this disclosure only to those cases where charges were framed at least six months prior to the date of elections. The Election Commission now makes affidavits of candidates available on their websites. ADR conducts “National Election Watch” for every National and Assembly Election in partnership with a nationwide network of organizations and in the process collected this data. This database [24] was used to analyze the issues of criminalization, money in elections, winnability, and role of gender in elections.

#### *Criminalisation of Politics*

##### a) Candidates

The RP Act as it stands today does not bar people with pending criminal cases who are not yet convicted from contesting elections. Meanwhile cases drag on for years and even decades, allowing many to continue to contest elections. Candidates convicted and sentenced for 2 years or more are disqualified for six years from the date of completion of the jail sentence. Those convicted by a lower Court are barred from contesting elections even if they have filed an appeal, unless they have been exonerated by a higher Court. Recently the Supreme Court disqualified sitting MPs and MLAs who are convicted. It struck down a provision in the RP Act that allowed such MPs and MLAs to complete their term in the Assembly or Parliament.

---

<sup>3</sup> A charge is framed by a court, typically a Judicial Magistrate First Class (JMFC), on the basis of a charge sheet filed by the Police after investigation. Thus FIR's against someone would not constitute a case as described by the Supreme Court

Analysis of 62,847 self-declared affidavits of candidates, covering all Assembly and Lok Sabha elections since 2004, including bye elections, shows that 11,030 (18%) had 27,027 pending criminal cases against them while 5,253 (8%) candidates had 13,984 serious criminal charges<sup>4</sup> including murder, rape, corruption, extortion, dacoity etc. That is more than 1 in 5 serious cases per candidate. Among serious cases, there were 1229 cases of murder, 2632 cases of attempt to murder, and 496 instances of violation of the Indian Penal Code (IPC) on other cases related to murder like culpable homicide, abetment to suicide etc. There were 68 rape cases, and 455 other cases for crimes against women. There were 978 violations of IPC sections related to kidnapping and abduction, and 1004 violations of IPC sections related to robbery and dacoity. There were 1319 cases against candidates for cheating. There were 1720 violations of IPC sections related to forgery and counterfeiting. In addition, there were 226 violations of IPC sections related to counterfeiting Government seals. There were 746 violations of IPC sections related to breaking the law during elections.

There were 8.3% of candidates with some serious case against them. About 2700 or 4.3% had two or more serious cases, 152 had ten or more such cases, 14 had 40 or more such cases, and 5 had more than 50 cases against them. Table 1 gives details. Even if we ignore so called trivial cases and focus only on serious cases, we find that all political parties field such candidates. It varies from a high of 17% for the Shiv Sena to a 'low' of 4% for the Asom Gana Parishad. We looked at 19 political parties which won nearly 90% of all seats. All of them fielded candidates with serious criminal cases, the average percent of such candidates being 9%. If we look at candidates with some criminal case, the percentage shoots up to 18%.

## b) Winners

Of the 8882 winners analyzed from 2004 to 2013, 2497 (28.4%) had 9993 pending criminal cases against them while 1187 (13.5%) candidates had 4824 serious criminal charges including murder, rape, corruption, extortion, dacoity etc. That is more than 1 serious case for every 2 winners. This is more than the 1 in 5 for candidates, meaning winners are more likely to be tainted. There were 335 instances of murder, 846 violations of IPC sections on other cases related to murder like culpable homicide, abetment to suicide etc. There were 17 rape cases, and 136 other cases for crimes against women. There were 282 violations of the IPC related to kidnapping, abduction and so on, and 276 violations related to robbery and dacoity. There were 909 violations of the IPC for cheating, forgery and counterfeiting. In addition, there were 76 violations for cases related to counterfeiting Government seals and 303 violations for cases related to breaking the law during elections.

---

<sup>4</sup> Serious crimes include murder, attempt to murder, rape, crimes against women, cases under the Prevention of Corruption Act, Maharashtra Control of Organized Crime Act, loss to public exchequer, State or National Treasury, Lok Ayukta initiated cases; forgery, counterfeiting and/or sale of Government documents, stamps; issue of non bailable warrants, and cases which on conviction would result in 5 years or more of jail (the RP Act disqualifies anyone sentenced for only 2 years or more).

There were 13.5% of winners with some serious case against them. About 678 or 7.71% had two or more serious cases, 50 had ten or more such cases, 2 had 40 or more such cases, and 1 had 69 cases. Table 1 gives details of candidates and winners. As is clear from the Table, the percentage of winners with serious charges is significantly higher than that among candidates.

Table 2 at the end compares candidates and winners. As can be seen, in every type of criminal case, the percent amongst winners is much more. There were on average 0.22 IPC sections for serious crimes against a candidate, while there were 0.55 against winners – 1 in 5 for candidates versus 1 in 2 for winners. These facts have led to a demand for barring candidates with serious criminal cases.

### *‘Winnability’ and Serious Crime*

While only 12% of candidates with a ‘clean’ record win on average, 23% of candidates with some kind of criminal record win, and more alarmingly, 23% of all those with serious criminal charges win. Nearly every party shows that a greater percentage of those with a serious criminal record win compared to those without any record. For instance, the BJP had 28% clean candidates who win versus 40% of candidates with serious criminal records who win. The figures for BSP are 7% and 16%, SP 16% and 31%, NCP 18% and 26%, JD(U) 21% and 50%, Shiv Sena 11% and 33%, AIADMK 51% and 73%, DMK 48% and 59% and so on. The INC very slightly reverses this trend with 39% and 34%. This partly explains the strong tendency of political parties to continue fielding people with badly tainted records. Unfortunately information about candidates’ criminal background is not easily available to voters. Table 3 at the end of this report summarizes the situation.

In addition, we find that several cases drag on for years. Over 3450 candidates had contested the elections more than once. Of them there were 849 with a criminal record the first time they contested, and 631 who had a criminal case the second time they contested. About 474 of them had the same cases pending against them for at least 4 years. This means that a person with serious cases against him can complete the term of an Assembly or Lok Sabha before his cases are disposed of. The need for barring such candidates becomes even stronger since they have had ample time to get their names cleared from the Courts.

### **Money power and Crime in elections**

The average assets go up from Rs.1.37 crore per candidate to Rs.2.03 crores for third place candidates, Rs.2.47 crores for runners up, Rs.3.8 crore for winners, Rs.4.27 crore for winners with some criminal record, and Rs.4.4 crore for winners with serious criminal records. Wealth increases the chances of winning, and a combination of wealth and criminal record increases it even further as 23% of tainted candidates win compared to only 12% of clean candidates. Some

extreme examples include Independents where the figures are Rs.54.6 lakhs (candidate), Rs.7.2 crores (winner), Rs.11.26 crores (winner with crime record) and Rs.15.1 crores (winner with serious crime record). Some of the major parties showing the same trend of increase in assets from candidate to winner to winners with crime records include the INC, BJP, BSP, SP, NCP, Shiv Sena, AIADMK, DMK and the Akali Dal. Table 3 illustrates the interaction of crime and money in elections.

Describing the role of money in elections, the then Chief Election Commissioner of India had said that about Rs.10,000 crores of black money was spent in the 2012 UP Assembly elections<sup>5</sup>. At Rs.25 crores in each constituency, and over 4000 Assembly seats all over India, this amounts to Rs.100,000 crores. If we take the Lok Sabha elections with 543 seats this adds up to another Rs.12,500 crores though the spending is much more here. Local elections including Municipal, District, Block and Panchayat, easily double that figure as there are lakhs of contested seats. However, many of the Panchayat elections are never held. Estimates vary from a total of Rs.150,000 crores to Rs.250,000 crores for all elections put together. This occurs once in 5 years and is adjusted for inflation as well. Until this flow of black money into elections is minimized, we cannot get good governance.

The estimate by the former Chief Election Commissioner shows that candidates exceed the legal limit on election expenses several times over. If we go by the recent declaration of a politician who said he spent over Rs. 8 crores, it is 20 times the current limit of Rs.40 lakhs per Assembly constituency. At the same time, an analysis of the election expenses filed by candidates with the Election Commission for the 2009 elections shows that the average spend was Rs.4.3 lakhs. Clearly there is under reporting of the election expenses. There is a provision in the Representation of People (RP) Act that empowers the Election Commission to countermand an election for false declaration of electoral expenses.

Meanwhile, wealth has become concentrated. The top 100 people in India have a combined wealth of US\$259 billion or about Rs.15,50,000 crores. India has the world's 6<sup>th</sup> largest number of dollar billionaires. The top 1% own 33% of the wealth and earn 17% of the total income of the nation<sup>6</sup>. To quote, "Businessmen today have a great influence on the economy, on employment, government policy, and sometimes, on politics as well. India's rupee billionaires have a combined wealth of about US\$357 billion, or 20% of the market capitalization of all listed companies in India. There were 657 rupee billionaires and 45 dollar ones in 2011"[25]. The declared wealth of each ultra-high-net worth individual (UHNI) is several times the combined declared wealth of all the politicians in Parliament put together. At the same time, inequality has risen and India has the largest number of people below the poverty line. With much greater awareness thanks to TV, mobile and large scale migration of working class rural populations, that inequality has become more glaring. Exposure to consumer goods and lifestyles of the well

---

<sup>5</sup> New Indian Express, Jan 10, 2012: Reforms must to rid polls of black money; IBN Live Jan10, 2012: Cash haul in UP, Punjab: black money running Assembly polls?; Times of India March 29, 2011: EC's mission- track Rs.10,000 crore in 2 weeks.

<sup>6</sup> Financial Express, November 11, 2013, and Times of India October 9, 2013



to do has perhaps changed aspirations of the working class. In the final analysis, extreme inequality and democracy are perhaps incompatible.

There is a proliferation of candidates and parties. In the recent Lok Sabha 2009 elections, 392 registered political parties contested for 543 seats. In most so called developed countries, the number is at most half a dozen. There were 14 candidates per Lok Sabha seat in 2009 of which 7 were Independents. The same is true in several State Assembly elections.

If we pause for a moment to reflect on these developments, we may be able to see how the role of crime and money would play out in such a messy competitive election scenario with rising inequality. Most parties no longer reflect the interests of a broad spectrum of citizens. They need only a small percentage of swing votes to win. A winner got 25.7% of the registered voters on average in the last Lok Sabha, and 44.2% of the votes cast; 423 MPs in the current Lok Sabha won with less than 50% of the votes cast, 167 of them with less than 40%. Of the registered voters, 538 won with less than 50%, 506 with less than 40% and 356 with less than 30%. If we look at the percent of votes that MPs in the ruling coalition got out of the total votes cast it is less than 19%<sup>7</sup>. As a percent of the total registered voters it is less than 11%<sup>8</sup>. But the ruling coalition controls the Government, the budgets, and new legislation. While this is natural in a multi-party system, it does raise questions about how representative elected MPs, MLAs and Governments are.

To win an election, an astute candidate has to therefore manage a small fraction of voters. Buying votes and providing freebies is one way to try and win elections. There is big money available to finance such elections. In a repeat of the muscle man turned politician of the 1980s, we now see the moneyed person turned politician today. A senior leader of a political party said that 92% of the applications for tickets were from builders and real estate businessmen in one southern city. The leader of the rival party agreed with this.

### ***Growth in Assets***

Of 3452 candidates who contested more than one election, 2967 showed an increase in wealth. This includes all those who contested elections more than once between 2004 and 2013 and includes all State Assembly elections, and the Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha elections since all of them went to the polls at least twice during this period. The average declared wealth of such re-contesting candidates in 2004 was Rs.1.74 crores, and Rs.4.08 crores in 2013, an increase of 134%. For winners, the average assets went up from Rs.1.8 crores to Rs.5.81 crores, an increase of 222%. Winners are able to increase their wealth much faster than other candidates.

---

<sup>7</sup> The parties got more votes, but here the losing candidates votes are not being counted

<sup>8</sup> All data and percentages in this section are from the Election Commission

## **Gender and Elections**

Of the 62847 candidates, only 6.6% were women, and of the 8882 winners only 7.6% were women. They are still under represented in elections. Of the 2575 winners with criminal charges only 4.3% are women and of the 1187 winners with serious criminal charges, only 3.1% are women. A greater representation of women would perhaps improve the situation. However like men, the percentage of women with criminal records who win (16.4%) compared to women with clean records who win (10%) is higher. For men the comparable figures are 30.4% and 18.1% respectively. For those with serious criminal cases the figures are 5.5% and 3.9% for women, and 14.2% and 8.7% for men.

Women also show an increase in declared assets in general over crime and money as do men. The average assets of women candidates is Rs.1.46 crores (men Rs.1.37 crores), women winners Rs.4.46 crores (men Rs.3.78 crores), women winners with criminal charges Rs.4.04 crores (men Rs.4.32 crores) and women with serious criminal charges Rs.5.77 crores (men Rs.4.34 crores). The higher average assets of women may come as a surprise and is due to the presence of outliers and large standard deviations.

### *An overview of today's situation*

A total of 4807 sitting MPs and MLAs as of August 2013 were analyzed of which 1460 (30%) sitting MPs and MLAs have declared criminal cases against themselves and 688 (14%) have serious criminal cases. If anything, the situation has slightly worsened since the data was publicly available and analyzed since 2004 when the comparable figures for winners with a criminal charge were 28.4% and winners with serious criminal charges were 13.5%.

In the current Lok Sabha, 162 (30%) out of the 543 MPs have criminal cases of which 76 or 14% have serious criminal cases. Compared to that, in the State Assemblies, 1258 (31%) out of the 4032 sitting MLAs from all state assemblies have criminal cases and 15% have serious cases.

## **Some implications**

In analyzing such a complex set of events and trends, it may be important to focus on the two things that drive politics – power and money. Those in power need to make money to ensure the next victory in an increasingly high stakes, high risk, competitive political environment. In this era of coalition politics with several small parties, the role of money will become even more important. Real estate, infrastructure, PPP projects and natural resources are opportunities for creating wealth. All of them have links with elections and politics today. So money and power feed each other. All this is well understood. Perhaps there was a time when ideologies played a role and influenced people to join politics. Today there seems to be a digression and politics

merely uses the camouflage of ideology to garner votes and come to power. The difference between adhering to an ideology and using it for electoral gains has become clear.

The major impact of all this is on the quality of governance. Any winning candidate who spends lavishly in elections will focus on recovering his investment or returning favours to those who funded him. The same is true of political parties and of ruling coalitions. A superficial analysis says that voters have become savvy, take money from all candidates, and then vote for the candidate of their choice. Therefore the misuse of money no longer affects the outcome. This is clearly not true as the earlier analysis reveals. But even if it were true, governance will suffer no matter who wins because all have spent huge sums. A clean election process is important to ensure good governance, even if it has no impact on the final outcome. Elections are not only about who wins, but also about the quality of governance we get. With so many parties and unstable ruling coalitions, there will be greater opportunity for big money and some corporate houses to adversely influence Government policy and legislation. The problem of misuse of funds in elections goes to the heart of the matter. A former Chief Minister of a major state said that to fight corruption, the problem of money in elections needs to be tackled.

### **The Way Forward**

Gandhiji said “To safeguard democracy the people must have a keen sense of independence, self-respect, and their oneness.” Whether we have the first two is not clear. But we certainly don’t have oneness. Political parties currently tend to divide voters further. Perhaps some of those with privilege and those who are concerned would need to come together to build that sense of independence, self-respect, and oneness. As Nelson Mandela said “For to be free is not merely to cast off one's chains, but to live in a way that respects and enhances the freedom of others.” If the elites imbibe that spirit much can be achieved.

In this light, we examine possible solutions on four dimensions: structural, legislative, administrative, and civil society led changes. The media continues to play an active role in all this. Unlike other leading democracies, the corporate sector has not yet come forward to engage openly with improving elections and governance. This may be understandable where being on the wrong side of power may have consequences.

In the recent past several Commissions have been set up to examine the issue of electoral and political reforms. They include the Goswami Committee on Electoral Reforms (1990), the Vohra Committee Report (1993), Indrajit Gupta Committee on State Funding of Elections (1998), Law Commission Report on Reform of the Electoral Laws (1999), National Commission to Review the Working of the Constitution (2001), Election Commission of India – Proposed Electoral Reforms (2004), and The Second Administrative Reforms Commission (2008). Recently, the Government has once again appointed a Law Commission to examine the issue disregarding the excellent recommendations made by the previous Committees and Commissions. Clearly there is a

hesitation to implement the recommendations. On the legal front, there is a long list of suggested remedies by the various Commissions. Some of the more popular ones include barring candidates with several serious criminal charges, and making political parties accountable for fielding such candidates. But it remains to be seen whether Parliament and the current political system will pass suitable legislation.

The Lok Sabha needs to be compared with other Parliaments. An MP represents over 13 lakh voters on average. The next highest is the US, where a Congressman represents 5 lakh voters. The UK, France and Germany all have less than 100,000 voters per elected representative. In this sense, India is the least representative of all democratic countries. This is further compounded by the vast number of political parties which leads to winners that represent only a fraction of voters.

There are several radical suggestions including changing the system from the first past the post to a US style Presidential system, or a European style proportional representation system, or French style run-off elections between the top two candidates if no one gets more than 50% of the vote. There are various hybrids of these as well, including the Japanese multi member constituencies where in addition to the first past the post winners, electoral districts elect several members based on number of votes a party gets. These issues have been discussed at great length by scholars as well as the various Commissions referred to earlier. The three major issues that need to be balanced are (i) the quality of representation within a constituency, that the French and Japanese systems improve, (ii) the quality of representation of a political party that the proportional representation system improves as seats are allocated in some proportion to the overall votes a party gets, and (iii) a faster decisive functioning of Government that a Presidential system tries to achieve. Given deep ideological preferences, we are unlikely to achieve a consensus on this and may not see a change in the near future.

One of the several ways money power can be contained is to reduce the fierce competition for votes. This happens in closely contested electoral constituencies. Insisting on either winning the election decisively with say, at least a 5% margin, or getting more than 50% votes in a second round run-off poll makes it much more difficult to buy so many votes. Similarly, declaring anyone with more than 40% of votes cast as a representative as in multi member constituencies in Japan will help. A proportional representative system is welcomed by various groups – the Dalits, the Muslims, the communists, the urban professional class, and so on. They see a clear possibility of increasing their presence in State Assemblies and Parliament as they get a small fraction of the pan India votes. The increasing clamor for a Presidential style system reflects the deep disappointment with unstable, corrupt Governments. Often stability is sought from dictatorship or an authoritarian regime. While this may perhaps achieve something in the short run, authoritarianism is antithetical to democracy, and may do long term damage. Each

alternative has its advantages and disadvantages, and much wider public debate and discussion is required to evolve a consensus if we want a change from the current system,

Another important legal remedy is to enact a Bill to regulate the functioning of Political Parties. One such draft Bill has been prepared and circulated for discussion by civil society under the Chairmanship of a former Chief Justice of India [26]. It seeks to introduce greater democracy and transparency in Political parties as this is vital for reforming our system. Political parties nominate candidates and contest elections. A party that is internally autocratic cannot function democratically once it comes to power. A small but growing section of concerned and informed citizens is pushing for such a Bill. Companies, Banks, Cooperatives, NGOs, Trusts, Societies, Temples, Mosques, Churches and other places of worship, Hospitals, Educational Institutions and so on have to comply with increasingly interfering State and Government regulations and legislation. Only political parties are relatively exempt.

Going beyond legal remedies, the administrative systems introduced by the Election Commission are largely to be commended. Starting with the Code of Conduct, successfully curbing election related violence and booth capturing, tracking the flow of money and liquor to the extent possible during elections, putting in systems for election expenses within the existing laws and other measures have improved things considerably. However, the vexed question of misuse of money during elections has not been fully addressed. The system of election observers needs to be strengthened or re-looked at. When even the CECs have publicly said that black money is freely used in elections, and have appointed special expenditure observers, it is surprising that not one election in the Lok Sabha has been set aside. Meanwhile, the public and the media openly report this. The first “corrupt Practice” listed in the RP Act is bribing voters during elections. Surely it merits action. A liberal interpretation of the powers of the Election Commission can address this problem. Also, since adequate information to voters is not available, the candidate affidavits in a summary form should be prominently displayed in each polling booth so that voters can see them before voting.

Civil society has played a vital role in various Court Judgments and CIC rulings as described earlier. However, one role civil society can play effectively is in voter education campaigns. It is perhaps pertinent to recall what Gandhiji said “In a true democracy every man and women is taught to think for himself or herself.” Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the longest serving US president, like Gandhiji says “Democracy cannot succeed unless those who express their choice are prepared to choose wisely. The real safeguard of democracy, therefore, is education.” If voters stop taking bribes and stop voting for people with serious criminal cases, the system will automatically change. This is not as far-fetched as it may sound, since voters already do that in states with high levels of education like Kerala and some North-Eastern States. Changes in voter and citizen behavior are perhaps the best guarantee for de-criminalization and good governance. Traditional voter awareness campaigns, focused on saying “Go out and vote” need to be

supplemented by “Don’t sell your vote, and don’t vote for tainted candidates”. The first campaign is largely for the upper and middle class voters where voting percentages are low. The latter is for working class and poorer voters, who do go out and vote in large numbers in any case.

There is a view that it is elitist and ignorant to think that voters are not aware. Needless to say they are fully aware of ground level reality, the campaign rallies, the display of money, buying of votes in various parts of the country, the caste, religious and regional identities of candidates and parties, their own interests, and their expectations from the political system. As many point out they increasingly take gifts from one candidate and vote for another. But a deeper understanding of the link between black money, vote buying, corrupt elections and corrupt Government delivering bad governance needs to be built. They sometimes don’t see how they themselves suffer and get bad schools, health care, roads, corrupt Government, and bad implementation of various government schemes. The EC could also consider such a campaign, and it certainly has sufficient resources to do it. Needless to say, media support is vital. The more thoughtful seek an incentive system that makes political parties less corrupt: in other words, how do we ensure that it is in the political parties’ interests to go in for clean elections, clean candidates, and deliver good governance? A perfect alignment between voters’ interest in good governance and political parties’ interest in winning elections may never be possible. Such an incentive system needs to be supplemented with active civil society involvement and much higher voter awareness. If we can move forward on some of these suggestions, it may lead us to clean elections, clean candidates, strong political parties and good governance.

*Democracy is a faith in the spiritual possibilities of not a privileged few but of every human being.*

*-Dr. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan*

<b>Table 1: Percent of candidates and winners in India with Serious Criminal cases*: 2004-2013</b>				
# of serious cases	# of such candidates	% candidates	# of such Winners	% winners
>50	5	0.01%	1	0.01%
>40	9	0.01%	2	0.02%
>30	17	0.03%	3	0.03%
>20	50	0.08%	17	0.19%
>10	152	0.24%	50	0.57%
>5	433	0.69%	127	1.44%
>4	627	1.00%	184	2.09%
>3	971	1.54%	270	3.07%
>2	1533	2.44%	416	4.73%
>1	2700	4.30%	678	7.71%
>0	5253	8.36%	1187	13.50%

\*Serious crimes include murder, attempt to murder, rape, crimes against women, cases under the Prevention of Corruption Act, Maharashtra Control of Organized Crime Act, loss to public exchequer, State or National Treasury, Lok Ayukta initiated cases, forgery, counterfeiting and/or sale of Government documents, stamps; issue of non bailable warrants, and cases which on conviction would result in 5 years or more of jail (the RP Act disqualifies anyone sentenced for only 2 years or more).

**Table 2: Summary of serious criminal charges on Politicians**

(All State Assembly, Lok Sabha, Rajya Sabha elections from 2004 to September 2013)

Serious cases: Instances of IPC sections on Candidates and Winners				
	No of IPC sections against Candidates	IPC section per candidate	No of IPC sections against Winners	IPC section per winner
Murder	1229	0.02	335	0.04
Other murder related	3128	0.05	846	0.10
Rape	68	0.00	17	0.00
Other crimes against women	455	0.01	136	0.02
Robbery and dacoity	1004	0.02	276	0.03
Kidnapping	976	0.02	282	0.03
Cheating, forgery, counterfeiting	3039	0.05	909	0.10
Government seal counterfeiting	226	0.00	76	0.01
Electoral frauds	226	0.00	303	0.03
Sub total	10351	0.16	3180	0.36
All other serious charges	3633	0.06	1644	0.19
Total	13984	0.22	4824	0.55

Note: the data show that there was one serious charge for approximately every 5 candidates (0.22), and one for every 2 elected representatives (0.55).



**Table 3: Relative chances of winning for clean and tainted candidates**  
(All State Assembly, Lok Sabha, Rajya Sabha elections from 2004 to September 2013)

Party	Contested	Won	% of contested seats won	% of those with clean records who won	% of those w charges framed who won	% of those w serious charges who won*
INC	6322	2453	39%	39%	37%	34%
BJP	5605	1689	30%	28%	38%	40%
BSP	4738	430	9%	7%	17%	16%
SP	2090	418	20%	16%	31%	31%
CPM	1163	520	45%	49%	35%	34%
NCP	1085	225	21%	18%	30%	26%
JD(U)	1005	272	27%	21%	43%	50%
AITC	904	256	28%	25%	40%	48%
JD(S)	655	81	12%	11%	19%	15%
RJD	618	125	20%	18%	25%	25%
CPI	602	91	15%	12%	25%	24%
SS	590	135	23%	11%	37%	33%
AIADMK	426	234	55%	51%	68%	73%
RLD	393	29	7%	6%	12%	18%
DMK	315	167	53%	48%	65%	59%
TDP	312	127	41%	38%	48%	56%
BJD	233	197	85%	85%	82%	75%
SAD	209	117	56%	59%	48%	50%
AGP	180	39	22%	23%	11%	14%
INDEP	19819	348	2%	1%	5%	6%
Sub Total	47264	7953	17%	15%	27%	26%
Total	62847	8882	14%	12%	23%	23%

\*This column shows for instance that of all candidates with serious criminal charges put up by the INC, 34% won.

**Table 4: Interaction of Crime and Money in Elections**

(All State Assembly, Lok Sabha, Rajya Sabha elections from 2004 to September 2013)

Party	% of those w serious charges who won	Avg Assets of such cand (Rs lakhs)	Avg. Assets of such Winners (Rs lakhs)	Avg. Assets of winners w charges framed (Rs lakhs)	Avg. Assets of winners w serious charges framed (Rs lakhs)
INC	34%	432.6	581.2	801	675.6
BJP	40%	179.7	288.4	340.2	387.4
BSP	16%	125.9	273.7	256.2	278.3
SP	31%	152.6	416.7	412.5	546
CPM	34%	27.3	21.2	20.9	23.1
NCP	26%	140.7	356.2	331.5	414.5
JD(U)	50%	133.3	361.6	85.5	92
AITC	48%	136.8	131.3	79.7	98.8
JD(S)	15%	473.4	772.6	366.6	616.7
RJD	25%	57.3	70.2	76	89.9
CPI	24%	28	29	22	35.9
SS	33%	122.5	227.9	261.5	339.5
AIADMK	73%	203.8	289.6	539.4	479.9
RLD	18%	119.4	379.1	694.6	790.3
DMK	59%	301.6	294.6	290.8	489.7
TDP	56%	561.4	872.2	613.1	276.8
BJD	75%	101.3	110	62.5	53.7
SAD	50%	602	627	873.4	1,734.00
AGP	14%	62.5	77.2	54.1	23.2
INDEP	6%	54.6	720.4	1,125.60	1,512.10
<b>Total</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>137.1</b>	<b>380.7</b>	<b>427.2</b>	<b>438.2</b>

**Table 5: Growth in Assets**

<b>Growth in Assets: Candidates, Winners, Tainted Winners</b>				
<b>PARTY</b>	<b>Growth in Avg Assets of All Candidates</b>	<b>Growth in Avg. Assets of Winners</b>	<b>Growth in Avg. Assets of Winner with criminal charge</b>	<b>Growth in Avg. Assets of Winner with serious criminal charge</b>
<b>INC</b>	71.0%	201.4%	380.4%	340.9%
<b>BJP</b>	63.1%	142.0%	158.4%	178.0%
<b>BSP</b>	91.3%	358.9%	499.1%	621.7%
<b>SP</b>	179.8%	162.6%	302.3%	383.9%
<b>CPM</b>	79.0%	63.9%	199.5%	122.7%
<b>NCP</b>	85.9%	336.0%	335.6%	352.4%
<b>JD(U)</b>	52.3%	120.0%	90.4%	201.5%
<b>AITC</b>	551.4%	172.2%	208.4%	106.9%
<b>JD(S)</b>	363.3%	207.0%	66.0%	-25.2%
<b>RJD</b>	156.4%	230.3%	61.8%	99.1%
<b>CPI</b>	57.3%	148.0%	34.6%	-30.5%
<b>SS</b>	226.0%	387.1%	545.0%	1145.0%
<b>AIADMK</b>	459.0%	295.7%	59.3%	276.1%
<b>RLD</b>	281.3%	236.9%	506.3%	905.3%
<b>DMK</b>	303.6%	439.6%	252.1%	681.1%
<b>TDP</b>	105.5%	1069.3%	-	-
<b>BJD</b>	139.4%	176.8%	194.5%	148.3%
<b>SAD</b>	62.9%	173.8%	209.8%	701.1%
<b>AGP</b>	267.0%	652.9%	265.5%	-
<b>IND</b>	53.6%	286.6%	271.6%	260.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>133.4%</b>	<b>206.3%</b>	<b>282.9%</b>	<b>275.3%</b>

Figures show assets growth of candidates and winners after Jan 1, 2009 compared to those before that.

## References:

- [1] Writ Petition (civil) 490 of 2005, Lily Thomas vs Union of India; July 10, 2013
- [2] SPL (Civil) of 2004, Chief Election Commissioner vs Jan Chaukidar.
- [3] Civil Appeal No. 5130 OF 2013 (Arising out of SLP (C) No. 21455 of 2008), S. Subramaniam Balaji vs Govt of Tamil Nadu
- [4] Writ Petition (civil) No. 121 of 2008, Resurgence India vs Election Commission of India, 13/9/2013
- [5] Writ Petition (civil) no. 161 of 2004, PUCL vs Union of India, 23/09/2013
- [6] Central Information Commission Decision CIC/SM/C/2011/000838 dated 03-06-2013
- [7] Writ Petition (civil) no. 242 of 2001, B.R. Kapoor vs State of Tamil Nadu, 21/09/2001
- [8] Union of India v Association for Democratic Reforms, Appeal 7178 of 2001 with Writ Petition (C) NO 294 OF 2001; 2 May 2002; Appeal from: CWP 7257 of 1999 (High Court, Delhi)
- [9] Criminalization of politics and electoral reform in India, George T. Haokip, *The International Journal of Social Sciences Research* ISSN2320-5113 April 2013: V 1No 4
- [10] Do Cleaner MPs Lead to a Cleaner Parliament? D. Tiwari, Oxford India Policy Series, Special Series: Decriminalisation of Indian Politics, May 2013
- [11] “Criminal Politics”: A Byproduct of Ethnic Voting?, S. Chauchard, Oxford India Policy Series, Special Series: Decriminalisation of Indian Politics, May 2013
- [12] The Demand for Criminal Politicians, *M Vaishnav*. Oxford India Policy Series, Special Series: Decriminalisation of Indian Politics, May 2013
- [13] Caste Politics, Credibility And Criminality: Political Selection In India, Milan Vaishnav, Columbia University, Sep, 2011
- [14] Proposals for Decriminalising politics in India, *Baijayant ‘Jay’ Panda, Member of Parliament, Lok Sabha*, Oxford India Policy Series, Special Series: Decriminalisation of Indian Politics, May 2013
- [15] Criminalisation of Politics Empowerment of Voter, Madhav Godbole, Economic and Political Weekly April 25, 1998.
- [16] Religion, Caste, and Politics in India, by Christophe Jaffrelot, Primus Books 2012

[17] Criminalisation of politics as a threat to Indian democracy, M. I. Minch, Radix International Journal Of Research In Social Science, Vol 2, Issue 2, Feb 2013

[18] Toward state funding of elections in India? A comparative perspective on possible options, E. Sridharan, The Journal of Policy Reform, Volume 3, Issue 3, 1999 [19]

[19] M. V. Rajeev Gowda and E. Sridharan. Election Law Journal: Rules, Politics, and Policy. June 2012, 11(2): 226-240. doi:10.1089/elj.2011.0131.

[20] Electoral Reforms: Need for Citizen Involvement, J.S. Chhokar, Economic and Political Weekly Oct 20, 2001

[21] Reforming the electoral system, J. S. Chhokar, Seminar 2003

[22] Electoral Reforms and Citizens' Initiatives, Trilochan Sastry, Economic and Political Weekly March 27, 2004

[23] Disclosure Norms, Trilochan Sastry, *Seminar*, July 2005

[24] Association for Democratic Reforms (ADR) database: [www.adrindia.org](http://www.adrindia.org) and [www.myneta.info](http://www.myneta.info)

[25] Exploring the role of business in society, Trilochan Sastry, IIMB Management Review (2011) 23.

[26] The Political Parties (Registration and Regulation of Affairs, etc.) Bill, 2011, *draft bill for wider circulation and discussion*, [www.adrindia.org](http://www.adrindia.org).