

Note: This is a modelling, done based upon analysis of existing facts and evolving reasoning, as to how the 'Government' and 'Constituents of Governance' are likely to behave and function 'influenced by normal human attributes' under different 'probable conditions' and does not imply projection or criticism of 'any particular government system in the world'. Any explanation in this 'coinciding with any working Government system' shall be an unintentional coincidence only.

Democracy Redefined

This chapter helps us to understand:

1. **Democracy must be defined at a place which would be accepted by every Government and Governance system. So the 'nation' must have 'Code of Governance COG/Constitution' in written form elaborating 'democracy' comprehensively**
2. **Citizen perception about 'democracy' is relative and not a justified measurement. Democracy need to be defined and measured in 'absolute terms'**
3. **COG must define 'Government's responsibilities towards 'Nation and the Citizen'. Validation of Government's fulfillment of such obligations and its measurement requirements must be covered which would substantiate 'Democracy'.**
4. **Democracy should be a government system for the people and governed by the basic instinct of carrying Government's responsibility to help them to 'evolve, develop and progress' unitedly.**
5. **COG should define 'Democracy' its definition, objectives, goals and methodologies to achieve goals, measurements of benefits/outcomes, Responsibilities and accountabilities of the government system and its organs, public representatives being true citizen representatives, participation of citizen transparently etc from government side.**
6. **COG should bring out the objectives of the government system/Democracy, its duties and responsibilities and criteria of self-assessment and external assessment with 'communication' transparently**
7. **Democratic system must 'first and mainly emphasize' upon the RAA of the government, government people, political parties and their people than anything else.**
8. **Democracy is 'citizen getting what is due to them'; so Government to first define what are citizen rights which eventually are 'Government's responsibilities'.**
9. **Government would deliver 'Security from SNF, safety, development, progress, best public services but affordable, Best education and health but affordable, high**

citizen living parameter, Government's honesty and responsibility, high government RAA, harmony, Independence/freedom, right to select sincere representatives, Government's direct communication, Open eye justice system, effective fast delivery of justice, public service orientation of PL

10. If such governance system is termed as 'democracy' which establishes system electing public representatives who are anti-social and selfish, would be example of 'Master's designed Democracy', an act presenting high MUBI governance.

11. Thus it is not 'selection' which should be the spirit of an election, but it must be 'rejection'. A selection based 'elections' are meaningless and not an exposition of 'democracy'.

12. Governance System which would lead to having few people in prominence and government repeatedly, is prominent symptom of the Master Slave Government.

13. Democracy of numbers is the origin of 'corruption' and 'irresponsible behaviour' which must be corrected. Largest party should form government so there is no space for selfish acts of 'trading, bargains, change of party, opportunistic coalitions' etc

14. If the election process is driven by slogans, posters, speeches, promises, temporary benefits, ghost schemes, dreams, criticism of others; the state of the citizen society would be LASP or negative CEAK level.

15. Principles of Democracy:

- I. Selection vs Rejection**
- II. Minimum Return of Votes-MIRVO**
- III. Minimum relative position difference MRD**
- IV. Coalition of Parties COPA**
- V. Entire nation elects RON**
- VI. Democracy of Numbers DON**
- VII. Decision making in Parliament by 'secret vote' DSV**
- VIII. Change of parties by candidates COP**

For last few centuries the citizen governance system was in the form of 'Kingdoms'. The citizen were being ruled by the Kings, mainly hierarchical in a family. There was no suitability criteria except the muscle power and have no say whatsoever, in general, as regards to their rights.

As the mankind evolution occurred, it was felt that the 'welfare of citizen' was not at focus of kings whereas they are 'human' with equal worth. So the concept of democracy evolved to 'provide powers to citizen' to elect their representative. However, the notion that this would provide 'powers' in the hands of citizen remained 'questionable' as the one who is elected by the citizen, would always have the choice to behave 'selfish'. And with this the citizen fate remains uncertain as it was under the 'king'.

The word 'Democracy' is inadequate and insignificant, as it is, without defined objectives, goals, and need elaborated objectives, goals, personal character valuation, performance tracking and monitoring and authorizing citizen to know everything on real time basis.

Democracy- Perception vs Reality

Over the globe there are different political systems, different constitutions both in its physical form and in its application, different perceptions of development and progress, different approach to rule and different definitions to rule. Even one type of political system is applied in many different forms. For example, democracy in India is of a different form than democracy in UK which again is different from US democratic system. It is interesting to see that different types of democratic systems are being practiced in different countries. **Is it possible that all these different systems are parallel and equal 'democratic system' providing equal democratic values to the nation and citizen? How it can be?** The fundamental as applicable presently may be that any system is democratic if the perception of the people about it is for 'its being so'. This leads to further intricacies. **This would mean that any system even if it is not democratic but would be recognized as democratic, if the perception of the people holds it.**

So as per present commonly known basis of democracy, the perception of the people would decide if a system is democratic or..... what?

What? is a question which emerges out of the above analogy and becomes significant that if democratic attributes of a system are not absolutely defined, how could perception of the people about it, can be correct and well defined specially when common people of a country do not know and understand about the systems prevailing in other parts of the world. Thus citizen also do not know and understand how fair is 'their perception about democracy' which they hold. So where from they get this perception? **They get the perception about democracy, obviously from the rulers the 'government'.**

So the important question becomes 'does the Government understand and define the 'democracy' correctly encompassing Government's obligation towards the citizen the best way.

Therefore, it would be the rulers or the government which would present a system, presumably suitable to them and define it as democracy and the common people (public) only would follow

it. But this derivation itself goes against **the real interpretation of democracy as democracy should be a government system for the people and governed by the basic instinct of carrying Government's responsibility to help them to 'evolve, develop and progress' unitedly.**

Democracy yields to Citizen:

Democracy is 'citizen getting what is due to them'; so Government to first define what are citizen rights which eventually are 'Government's responsibilities'. **Government would deliver 'Security of SPF from SNF, safety, development, progress, best public services but affordable, Best education and health but affordable, high citizen living parameter, Government's honesty and responsibility, high government RAA, harmony, Independence/freedom, right to select sincere representatives, Government's direct communication, Open eye justice system, effective fast delivery of justice, public service orientation of GPP and PL**

The same would apply to any kind of political system either.

Democracy elaborations:

However, let we further analyze democracy as this is the most popular government system and most commonly adopted. There are Governance systems recognized as the democracy in the world. However, as discussed above it is necessary to evaluate if it is the real democratic system RDS, or 'perceived democratic system' PDS which is based upon a perception. A mention in the Constitution that the 'Government system' is democratic cannot be granted a status of Real Democracy unless evaluated and validated for a high +ve score. **Does Constitution define 'Democracy' its definition, objectives, goals and methodologies to achieve goals, measurements of benefits/outcomes, Responsibilities and accountabilities of the government system and its organs, public representatives being true citizen representatives, participation of citizen transparently etc from government side.**

Any large country has many disparities, virtually in all the fields. Can the same perception of democracy be equally applicable to all section of people or more important is, if the same perception of democracy is equally advantageous or disadvantageous, rewarding or unrewarding to all sections of people?

The term rewarding has been introduced to highlight that **the meaningfulness of any government system is to produce certain pre-identified 'gains to the people/citizen'.** Along with this the **other important criteria and basis for an analogy would be 'uplifting identity of the nation'.** These should be the ultimate analogy based upon which the political system of any country should be analyzed.

And for our discussions, Government system is 'democracy'

It seems difficult to realize that one perception or system will reward the people equally. The reverse analogy is that different people would have different perceptions about 'Government system' or democracy. This makes us to realize that the term democracy is not well defined and universalized. So the 'Constitution' needs to define 'democracy' first. **Constitution should bring out the objectives of the government system/Democracy, its duties and responsibilities and criteria of self-assessment and external assessment with 'communication' transparently.** Does any constitution provides these to what the term democracy means under it?

The constitution of one country is not adopted in other countries in order to maintain identity of a nation. The constitution thus belongs to a nation and not to a government. Therefore, the 'Nation' should be defined in the Constitution alongwith **what 'democracy' is all about, its definition, objective, derived interpretations, obligatory responsibilities of Government and accredited benefits to the people and the nation by the government etc.** And what is the harm if the constitution and democracy is structured and practiced in the same form all over.

As a universal datum, the democracy should be understood as 'government's responsibility and obligation' to provide 'certain benefits, support, gains' to the citizen. Therefore, would describe the 'rights of citizen' which are the duties of the 'Government' eventually.

Government's obligations:

Once a COG/constitution has been followed for Governance by a government, the Government and GPP becomes responsible to the COG. They have to fulfill their obligations for the citizen as a compulsion made mandatory by the COG and not as optional as the government may often decide to act.

In a governance system which is 'democratic', the focus is for the welfare on the citizen, thus government would mention notify and comply to the Citizen rights. These citizen rights would be 'Government's duties' and would be like Harmony, Higher CEAK, Higher average citizen, perfect public services, Health and Education, Equality and uniformity, protection from NSF, nationality, progress, development etc. The Government also has obligations to the nation for honesty, lawfulness, elections to select honest, sincere, devoted, lawful persons, participation of citizen in electing public representatives, controlling their public behavior etc.

Does the definition of 'democracy' in any nation's COG explicitly and elaborately contain these and **mentioning categorically that these are Government's responsibilities setting objectives and goals for a period and communicating the outcome regularly.**

Code of Governance COG (Constitution): Is this term defined in the COG of countries? Are the conditions to ascertain sovereignty, unity, boundaries, responsibilities in a nation mentioned? There are examples that in same country, a political leader of a province would publicly declare that the people from other states can not come into that state in the presence of Government at National level, clearly brings out that the term 'nation' is not well honoured and thus not well defined also. The inadequacy of its not having well defined in the COG can be a great contributory factor especially when the National Government also becomes a spectator. It brings out a very strange outcome that a **government instead of driven by the RAA behavioral attributes of the government, is rather driven by the 'personalized decision making of individuals'** in the government. (It is brought out in Decision making chapter that 'no decision by government is also considered as 'a government's decision' for not acting). If an elected government would officially not say anything against the communal attacks or crimes by MOG, OIG PL, is another example explaining how a government itself would fail to understand the term 'nation'. The **government would have this excuse of personalized decision making if the term 'nation' and government's RAA is not defined, in the COG'.**

There are still many examples. Political leader mentioning that his senior political leader and mentor is more important to him than the 'COG of the nation' defying the spirit of the COG and every one including the Government and ICE, DAU and Justice system, remained mute spectator passing on an explicit message that it was no body's job. Are such imprudent acts presenting gesture of indifferentness by the Government and its organs, as 'nobody's job or 'for what we are not responsible', was the objective of democracy? No it should not be, How it can be? This must be the other way. **Democratic system must 'first and mainly emphasize' upon the RAA of the government, government people, political parties and their people than anything else.** But a system without comprehensively covering Government's RAA and behavior of their people and organs, with some of the elaborations as above, cannot be stated to be a 'DEMOCRACY'.

Can an individual be more important than the nation and can the COG be made for an individual? Without defining the nation and the responsibilities of the government, any CGO is fundamentally deficient and would ultimately fall a prey to those who want to misuse it. And any person and government opting to misuse it would not be a fair one. So **such system would cover-up 'unfair and unjust action' of a government unless the term 'being fair and being just' for the government is not defined.**

So an unjust and unfair government would always prefer to have 'vague and incomplete CGO/Constitution'. Knowing the deficiencies very well, such government would not try to make up such deficiencies. So the obligations of 'democracy' shall not be met.

An important requirement here is to define relationship between the nation and the CGO. A nation must have a CGO, in written form necessarily, to establish its own identity and existence. The 'CGO' must specify and describe 'democracy' especially as regards to 'government duties

and government rights' and 'citizen rights', citizen duties. The government rights should not over shadow the 'citizen rights' as 'CGO must contain the 'government's obligations towards citizen and nation' as mandatory component.

For making the CGO, the ICE/government would appoint the experts, and under all probability, the leadership and action plan shall be under the government's authority. These would either produce replica of Government's ideas and aspirations or would put up their perceptions. Presenting Government's ideas shall not be the presentation of Democracy. Thus the CGO may be a book written by few people carrying their perception about it and transforming perceptions into physical form and therefore, would be the replica of their ideas, those few who would have written it. It would be a very subdued presentation. Having appointed by the government, these people would have inclination to configure the 'CGO' in a manner favouring to the government. This would be 'un-democracy' as **'democracy' would demand it to be configured placing citizen at higher position than 'government'**.

These principle, namely, CGO would first concentrate upon Government's duties (and citizen's rights), Government duties to the nation and the people and then cover the Citizen's duties, need to be conveyed as 'principal objectives'.

The **CGO should be thus 'by the nation' and 'for the citizen'**. Considering it in this form, some serious anomalies can be tackled with.

ELECTIONS

Elections, for the 'Government incumbents', is an important event in a democracy. The democratic and national aspirations may now be that election will be a process to bring forward selected citizens who would work for the goodness of the nation and citizen. And correspondingly **it should be a process having adequate screening and empowering citizens' ability to reject if someone is not deserving.**

Let we go by an example, which may ultimately come out to be a reality as it is, that in an election all candidates contesting election are criminals by nature. In any society where criminals and anti-socials(SNF) makes news and prevail, they would not only try to keep the honest and sincere (SPF) persons away from Government public representative's positions and succeed also.

The citizens of the constituency would not want that anyone of these candidates is elected. What option they have? Nothing and no option at all. Whatever the people do, at least one of these criminals would get elected. Ridiculous it is that in a democracy, the citizens can not exercise an option to stop wrong deeds and wrong people. Not only citizen but the government system and COG lack exercising such regulations. But it is true. The best the citizens can do is that they do not go for the polling, but some votes would be cast, at least those falling under direct influence of these candidates. Whatever votes are cast, anybody getting maximum

number of votes out of whatever cast, would get elected under this democracy. A democratic system which does not go by the wishes and feelings of the people but also leads to a situation of anti-citizen would rightfully be termed as 'undemocratic'. However, this would be natural choice for the government working in Master-slave governance as this would serve their purpose of making the people slave. Therefore, **if such governance system is termed as 'democracy' which establishes system electing public representatives who are anti-social and selfish, would be 'Master's designed Democracy', an act presenting high MUBI governance.**

Thus it is not 'selection' which should be the spirit of an election, but it must be 'rejection'. A selection based 'elections' are meaningless and not an exposition of 'democracy'.

Democracy principles:

Selection vs Rejection: SVR

We apply the universal analogy of goods in the market and buyers. The buyers go to the market to buy petty goods as per some quality standards. They would select the item, bargain the rates and would either select it or reject. How about if they have the compulsion of purchasing the goods, whatever they have touched, picked without having the right to 'reject'. Or forced to buy stuff, which is not acceptable by the purchaser being low quality. Irrational to think about it because rotten stuff, not acceptable to the people should be 'thrown away'.

So 'selecting' or 'picking up' would not be such an important right as the 'rejection'. The power of rejection is the fundamental right which would empower the people to exercise their option.

The candidates are to be selected (as goods picked purchased/owned by the people). If the people do not turn up for it, the deal fails and the goods are taken away from the market. There is some minimum level of buyer's option for it to make it acceptable. **The democratic process in major democratic systems has been overlooking this analogy and basic citizen's right. The right to reject.** Overlooking this apathy of the citizen from polling process and/or projecting it as citizen's fault, shall signify the presence of a high MUBI governance. To cover up and for self gains, this would also provide an unfounded excuse to the indifferent governing machinery, to spend huge money on advertisements throwing away all responsibility onto citizens for not participating in elections. Like advertisement saying that the people are sleeping if not going for casting votes. Without bothering to look at the simple universal analogy that a buyer would purchase a goods if it is of requisite 'quality' and would not cost much (to the society, in this case). **If the candidates in the market are not acceptable to the public (the buyers/users/beneficiary), its fair on their part not to participate in the process which has a faulty design for not only to get the 'unacceptable' selected but also validating the**

selection as the 'choice of the people'. The problem is not that of apathy of the citizen but elsewhere, with the government, which should, if this is happening, enhance citizen participation by placing the appropriate rules and procedures for screening of 'quality' of the candidates and realize that since producing such rules are within the powers of the citizen, its their prerogative not to turn up for polling.

It would be argued that how 'acceptance' and 'rejection' of parties or the candidates can be obtained from voters with so many parties and so many candidates in the election. It has been highlighted that, as immediate simple way, the party obtaining most extensive support from people (the first party) shall form the government under democracy. This would also 'Reject' others automatically. Thus the concept of rejection can be applied easily, if the 'democratic principles' cared for.

Minimum return of votes: MIRVO

Therefore, there must be a minimum return of votes expected against candidature of the candidates, if they are worth, noticeable and reliable. It will be tried to assess this return of vote (ROV) separately but a rough estimate may be total ROV of 50%. If the total return of votes is less, it should be taken as an evidence that the candidates in general are not acceptable to the voters (buyers) and election should be cancelled. It can be argued that the influence of an individual party or person may be such that it would prevent more than 50% of the voters to come to polling booth using its influence, Yes if so, either such a person should already be contesting election or if any party has failed to pick such a candidate, they should realize the mistake. If this is because of the use of Muscle power, the government is high MUBI. However, **by fixing the minimum ROV, all the contestant and parties shall try their best to bring the people to the polling booths.** It will minimize the selection of candidates who would grab tickets because of money power (which is the basis of black money concept) and not their Return on 'popularity power'.

Minimum relative position difference; MRD

The other anomaly being practiced and against democracy is, that even if a candidate has taken one vote more than the other candidate, it is the winner and other one is loser. This seems to have been formulated by an authority which did not know anything beyond the primary knowledge of counting and had no connection with the rational and its applications. This forms a very unreasonable conclusion that candidate with 1+ vote is the choice of the people and the candidate at 1(-) is not. This brings about another mockery of the democratic process. The citizens are human and not numbers of any mathematical quiz. Out of say 3,00,000 votes in a constituency, a candidate has got say, 90,001 and the other 90000. The one vote extra gained by first one is 0.0003% higher. Is it a reasonable justifiable difference that the first one is passed with distinction and the second one is failed with disgrace? **The difference between the candidates for passing the one and failing the other should be at least 5% of the votes**

cast, if it is less than that, equal opportunity in due to both of them to represent the people. That presents natural logic that the total duration of the term of the government should be divided equally or in the ratio of their gaining the public support, between them.

It may be argued that the same need to be applied further to provide opportunities to others in proportion of the votes they got. It would be ridiculous if this argument is placed by anyone because the winner in the election must be identified as the one who has secured maximum support. The methodology suggested above is just to eliminate the anomaly of injustice being imparted because of ambiguity in establishing a winner distinctly. **The one vote coming to just 0.00001% is too ambiguous to establish the winner distinctly.**

Coalition of parties: COPA

In a political party system the political parties contest elections based upon their ideologies, principles and plans of public welfare. They are different because of their principles and ideologies being different. The performance in an election directly indicates about the acceptance or otherwise, of the principles and ideologies of different parties. And parties got placed in respect of their acceptance. Their getting together joining hands does not conform to the 'democracy'. It is an injustice to the people if a party which is placed below in the ranking of obtaining votes during an elections, thus not accepted by the people. If this is permitted, this causes the 'installation' of 'Democracy of Numbers', which forms foundation of 'corruption' and install most unwanted practice of 'recognizing corrupt as Leader'.

It has been advocated that 'the party getting maximum candidates elected, should be permitted to form the government. The principle of MRD can also be applied between first two parties if the difference of candidates won, is less than 5%.

The formation of government by the first party is justified which would also rule out the so called 'horse trading' by the media which encourages the first party even to adopt the unfair means to arrange for more numbers by having 'under the cover' agreements and transactions, **thus making everyone corrupt, including those who could have acted 'fair and just'. If a governance system permits and rather compel 'two or more' parties to join hands, it represents a high MUBI governance.**

If any governance norm shall compel the first party to 'kneel down' to others who are down below, it would curse the 'citizen opinion'. The second party or others below would become more important to the first one, even more important than its own-self, and those who are below and less preferred by people, would 'shamelessly' bargain for self gains, which no 'democracy' should permit. Such formation of 'grouping' of political parties after the elections would only implant 'selfishness' in those who exists for 'selfless public service', spreading and universalizing the 'dishonesty and fraudulence' in the characters of those who 'must be' role models of 'honesty and selflessness'.

Representative of Nation RON

It is necessary now to introduce new terminology for those who control the government actions. The normal term like 'head of government/ nation' HOG, ICE etc need to be reinstated instead of 'power oriented designations', and rearranged to highlight that these denominations are below the status and dignity of a nation and not above it. Therefore, there can not be any status like 'Head of a nation' or any denomination supporting such expression. A nation is an absolute entity and can only be 'represented' by an individual. Therefore, the person leading the government, Head of Government, would also be 'representative of the nation'. As positioning of 'Independent Constitutional Entity' ICE, has been advocated in the other chapter, the other constitutional entity, would be designated as 'Monitor of the Nation' (MON) (like President), assigned primarily the responsibility of monitoring actions of HOG/RON and its government for being in the interest of nation and citizen.

Entire Nation Elects Representative of Nation ENERON

The election of head of a democratic country RON (Representative of nation) is very important. The same person is RON to the outside world and to citizen as 'Representative figure' and HOG as 'Head of Government' in its functional roles. To citizen, RON is 'Responsible person for their welfare'. Once a government has been formed, it becomes Head of Government HOG. The representative of a democratic state, say, ' HOG(like Prime Minister)', represents the 'nation' thus represents the entire land and the people and is the representative of the reputation and sovereignty of the nation.

The process of electing a RON, thus should be designed as the most important feature and action of the nation. In a democracy, this process would transfer the mandate of the people of whole nation to the election of RON.

Let us understand it with an example. In democratic governance system, universally a forum is created comprising of the 'Representatives of the people'. These representatives get elected in the process called 'elections'. This forum is normally called 'parliament', Legislative House, Assembly etc. For a parliamentary member position (MP), a constituency would have about from 0.5 to 1.0 million people. Thus taking average as 0.7 million people. Normally a MP would be elected by securing about 40% of the votes cast, a very high assumption, which comes to 0.2 million (200,000) people. The actual figures may be around 10-15% votes only.

Taking an example, there are 536 MPs in the house and PM is one selected out of them. Since PM should be from the party which is in majority, 2/3rd majority ideally, so one out of 273 people. This simple mathematics reveals that the HOG is an MP securing trust of 200000 people in one constituency, a very small part of the nation to which this person is going to lead and 272 people in the house. Mind it that these 272 people (MPs) are not going back to the people of their constituencies to seek their consent for electing the HOG, therefore, while voting for HOG they

are individuals, with all pros and cons associated to the choice and selection of any individual. HOG, thus becomes a representative of 2,00,272 people which is only 0.002 % of the total population. Can any thing be more unreasonable and irrational than this to the people of the nation? Just by managing 0.002 % people in a small area, $1/536^{\text{th}}$ part of land area/population of the whole country, a person can become Head of the Nation. So the easy target for a politician is to have resources to manage only these 0.002% people to become a HOG. The same analogy applies to Chief Minister of a state as the same procedure is applicable there also.

This system would always lead to having few people in prominence and government repeatedly, as once any body has generated resources to satisfy these 0.002% people, it would become immoral, undefeatable. **And this becomes the first prominent symptom leading to the Master Slave Government. Also after getting to power, the person, at the first instance, would accumulate adequate resources to manage these 0.002% people, in a manner and way they are manageable.** And the common criteria of manageably applicable universally is fulfilling their interests, the way they wish it to be.

And this generates selfishness both in the aspirants of RON and the other OIGs (MPs in this case). The candidates (OIG) elected by people for 'public service and citizen welfare' would turn into selfish individuals.

Managing the people of the nation is no issue at all if the average citizen score and CEAK score is negative representing MS governance as the people are too occupied in managing for their survival by their own self, than reacting to the election of MP or PM. Managing the elected 272 elected representatives has many dimensions including primarily fulfilling their personal interests. In such system the RON (HOG or allies) approach will be first to at least keep this minimum level of resources with it always and to enhance the resources further to meet the contingencies. Not only PM but anybody having aspirations to be PM, would try to build such resources to manage these people. And every MP would have such aspirations. So every elected MP and others in line up, would try to build resources, once having elected and/or get opportunity to place hands on government resources. Consequently, this would be an environment and not an isolated approach of an elected representative. The PM of the nation therefore, since representing 0.002% people, would be termed as '0.002% PM', thus the RON index of the position of PM would be 0.002.

If for simple understanding, we correspond the nation's resources, one to one, to the people in the nation, so for a population of 1200 million, the resources needed to keep people happy should be 1200 million units and these resources are at the disposal of the HOG. So this arrangement shall produce a natural choice for the aspirant to manipulate the resources for benefiting these 0.002 % people to pave an easy path to the leadership of the nation. Therefore, it would be a natural tendency and choice of any politician, whosoever, aspire to be the Representative of the nation, to manipulate the nations's resources. This requirement of

manipulation for managing 276 persons of the same rank and status becomes the prime reason of 'politician- businessmen' cartel and even HOG MOG tend to become aligned to this outcome.

Masterism-an Incentive: The most important question here becomes that why some one would have to manipulate and maneuver the Nation's own resources (NORCE) to become HOG, MOG, OIG etc and not that a person become HOG based upon the Suitability and Sincerity Index. This analysis is split in to two stages. Stage 1 is seeking trust of 700000 people of a constituency. These people (voted for him/her=Yes vote=YEVOT or Not voted for him =NOVOT) will extend their trust based upon their perceptions of one being suitable for doing welfare of the people and society, by making such policies and building up such systems. The perception of welfare and protection depends upon the social status of citizen and the status one conceives for itself in the society. A beggar would not demand for a palace as a deal of its welfare and similarly a rich would not be happy by obtaining a hut as deal of its welfare. So the YEVOT acceptability will be guided by the aspirations of members of the society only. No body will aspire to get to a status which is much outside and away from its sphere, since would become impractical and dreaming. So the development, an activity out of sphere of citizen, depends only upon the perception and action of the leader HOG, MOG OIG and the leader may have an incentive to keep majority of the society at a level where even essential needs are not met, so whatever leader provide as welfare to the people is readily considered acceptable by them. Being at a low level of not having self perception about setting a goal for themselves (or for the leader either) for reaching a conceived destination, they may be kept at a level where even essential becomes a luxury for them. This creates an incentive to a leader to keep the people at low level of 'lost self perception and aspirations' (LASP). LASP will also be low level of CEAK. So these people will vote only for a promised trust that the leader will do good to them, which may not even come true' to the extent (leader) can do or to the extent they needed. **So these people would vote for slogans, speeches, dreams and promises and temporary benefits** to provide short time support to their hopes. This becomes an easy job for the leaders. **This provides a very important analogy that if the election process is driven by slogans, posters, speeches, promises, temporary benefits, ghost schemes, dreams, criticism of others; the state of the citizen society would be LASP or negative CEAK level.**

The use of slogans, posters, emotions arising tact (EAT), posters, speeches would signify the high level of LASP and the use and application of these continuously for two elections would signify government and political parties creating slaves/ low CEAK people deliberately. It is very easy to understand that low level of LASP in citizen would result more demanding, producing real tests of ability for HOG/ MOG, therefore also producing chances of failure to meet the demands and thus resultant NoVOT for them. Thus if no sacrosanct 'checks and validation of sincerity' harnessed in the governance, they would like to be in Masterism and keeping people at high LASP (low and negative CEAK) level. **At high LASP people would not look for high**

'suitability and sincerity' in candidates as they would not have any perception of high SSI (or even low SSI).

However in stage-II, the leader has to manoeuvre other 272 persons who are also leaders, aspirants of the same position, thus they are the competitors. This is the most significant difference from the previous stage in which they were supported by 'followers'. They are coming from different- different constituencies, society, with different aspirations in nature and value, so they can not be manipulated with words and promises. Thus they need to be manipulated with transactional attributes. Thus they can be manageable only with the market theory that for obtaining hold on a commodity, the cost is to be paid. In market' terminology, this is known as 'purchased' and 'sold'.

In this stage-II, if one has to get over others, it must have substantial chunk of resource to overcome others. The popularity and image amongst people is not relevant any more as each one of them possess the same level of popularity (within the sphere they are coming from and which is only relevant criteria to them). If it's not popularity or the image, then it would only be a 'power or force' which can enable one to win over others. So the undemocratic contentions and procedures would take over at this most crucial stage of democracy. And two important forms of identified powers are 'money power' and 'physical power'. Money is 'money' possessing universal value recognizable by all, in all eventualities, and physical power can be out sourced from criminals. It depends upon different situation as to how which power is required to be applied but direct or indirect accessibility to both powers should exist. Presuming that these 273 people are at the same level of 'physical power' which would commonly exist, the 'money power' becomes most important. Is it not shocking. The system design of the democracy is such that it necessitates corruption at the highest political level. So those who aspire to get to high positions, get to this easy concept of 'corruption', than getting to the tough job of doing good to the whole nation and millions of people at one time, a much more tedious task. As seen earlier, the HOG would preferably do good only to 0.002% people to succeed to the position and doing good to the entire nation would not be any prerequisite to become HOG. Controlling 100% resources of the nation, having a political necessity to move towards corruption, the aspirant would certainly intend to manipulate with nation's resources or it would lose the position. This analysis and conclusion, no body ever would have liked to arrive at. Shocking and unpleasing but true. And once getting to the top using money and muscle power, anyone indulging into it would develop into a 'Master' Let we name this as 'Democracy design by Master's' or Master's designed democracy 'MADD'. And this kind of selection may be termed as 'Zero to Hero' in a day as the system does not warrant reporting back to people after the day of this selection.

Let we start with the initial presumptions. **The most important condition of a democracy ie a real democracy (Democracy Designed for Citizen) of a nation (DDC), is that the selection of the HOG, representative of the nation RON must be done by the entire nation, 100% people instead of 0.002% people. This will remove the stage-II in the**

presently existing system which will enable removal of corruption at high political level. With a corruption based government selection system in a country, the political leaders would never and never try to get a popularity at nation's level nor would try to do good to the entire nation. So over a period of time, **there would be no leader acceptable to the people of the entire nation. This creates a crowd of leaders who are said to be national leaders but without their individual identity being recognized** all over the nation. Thus they will have to depend upon others who are controlling smaller -smaller domains scattered all over and working out bargains of mutual benefits to promote one another into the people. This also is very interesting to analyze.

Say leader-1 in an attempt of seeking popularity and influence in a domain of leader-2, set to a bargain. The domain is controlled by leader-2 and it has been approached and bargained by leader-1 only because of leader-2 having control over its domain. Leader-2 will never like to lose its influence at the cost of bringing its domain under the influence of leader-1. So it would finally be a temporary arrangement to provide some temporary, one time benefit to leader-2 by leader-1 under some bargain or contract and leader-2 would make the people in its domain under its influence to benefit leader-1 temporarily to serve their mutual objectives under the contract of material benefits. This again leads to a potential source of corruption as the leader-1 would use nation's resources to provide some (undue) advantage to leader-2, to make use of its influence one time or temporarily in L-1's favour enabling L1 to achieve its stipulated goals. Going deep into this happening, another interesting but shocking fact comes up. L2 and the people of its domain P2 may have sentimental bonds being prolonged contacts and association, but P2 would have no attachment to L1 due to absence of interdependence or any association. They would also understand L2 being extending support to L1 because of getting benefits from L1. Thus there would be a demand from P2 also for getting undue benefits for supporting L1. **Thus a small deformation and anomaly in the model of formation of government would spoil the honesty and sincerity of everyone including the common men, may be hard to believe, but true.**

Democracy of numbers: DON

In most of the countries, the entitlement for the formation of Government is derived from the 'numbers of members' that party has. An analogy which not only creates MUBIs, but result 'deep roots of **'Mubism'** in the governance. Say in a house of 100 members, the first party need to demonstrate the support of 66 members to form the government. And in election the party got 55 members. Even though being largest party, it can not form the government and would now look for 'ways and means' to get 11 members to support them. Those who are in other parties, with whom they fought the election, those whom they criticized and condemned, those who also criticized and condemned them. If now they join hands, it would just be the 'mockery' of any idealism they showed in themselves. Normally no one would like to do. But if the 'constitution'

and 'governance system' of the country demands it, it would be most unfortunate as it would turn 'clean and principled' political party into a 'trader' and manipulator. The first party would go to all different parties which would not support based upon the 'ideology and principles' because these are different, the whole world knows, so they would join based upon terms and conditions. Both the parties cannot ask each other to change 'ideology' as it would never happen, so merger is no possibility. This would result most unwanted and undesirable situation that the 'first party', the **most powerful, shall exhibit fragile and those who are discarded by people become 'powerful'**. With **no compromise with the ideology, and being a rare opportunity, the others would ask for the 'self gains', which would be either 'position of profit' or money or both**. There cannot be any reason for change of mind to embrace each other today, who bitterly insulted and abused each other yesterday. There is one more cover up. The other party would declare support without merger, without joining government and from outside. This is just a 'declaration of asking for self-gains' repeatedly from First party, at each occasion, without owning any responsibility whatsoever. The worst abuse to the 'democracy'.

If any governance system, let we call it 'Democracy of numbers' DON, forces political parties to such 'trafficking', it cannot be democratic.

What would be a true 100% democracy? A state of affairs where the 'members of Parliament' or 'legislative house' are elected purely based upon their personal image and personal attributes, totally uninfluenced by any opinion requiring to substantiate it. So the person would not call for the support of ICE, HOG, MOG, OIG, MGG or the political party that they come and advise voters or request voters to vote for him/her. The candidate would also not require to highlight works done by him/her involving the propaganda tactics like posters, banners, loudspeakers, TV publicity and would fight elections based upon whatever image he/she have had built by virtue of its works of public welfare during the period of his/her stay as HOG. MOG, OIG, PL. If he/she worked well and maintained contact with the people all through, why he/she would need such propaganda tactics.

So an ideal and sincere candidate would fight elections without help from the party, HOG, MOG, OIG, PL. An ideal and sincere candidate must be indifferent from the existence of political party, HOG, MOG, OIG, PL etc.

Now say, there are ideal elections happening, no political party name and backup, no any support of any Government personality and there are only two domains, candidate and the citizen. The elections are held and the elected candidates reach the 'Parliament' / 'Legislative house'. All good and sincere people with no tag of 'political party'.

Who would form the Government now? Can the government be formed and deliver results?

Normally it would be felt that a 'good functional government' can not be formed. Let we understand that the HOG has been directly elected by the 100% population, so it is fixed without

any possibility of any change. MOG shall not be recommended to be directly elected as it would never be possible to change its field and portfolio even to whatever extent it may fail to perform. Also HOG must have discretion to select MOG and replace if necessitates.

Now HOG has picked up few from OIGs and formed team of MOG. And a proposal is now presented to parliament by the government. It has already been discussed that 'secret voting option' need to be deployed in line with 'democracy' providing freedom of expression without any reservation and constraints. The government proposal shall be voted by all OIGs freely in this case as the political parties would have issued directions and orders to vote as per their ambitions. Thus OIGs losing freedom of participation and expression.

As HOG/RON elected by the 100% people, directly, it would keep a balance for application of benefits over the entire area of the nation.

And the most prominent benefit would be that 'Government and GPP' will have little chance to go for 'corrupt actions and practices' which is of paramount importance as 'corruption' at 'government' level makes everyone corrupt in the nation.

Decision making in Parliament thro' Secret votes; DSV; To provide freedom of expression at this apex level of parliament and governments, it is necessary that 'secret voting' is adopted as standard system of 'obtaining consensus' in the proposals presented by the government. As OIGs elected under the 'banner' of a political party would be controlled by the leadership of the party restricting the free participation and free opinion.

In a 'democracy', if based upon DON, and permits parties coming together after election, it is 'undemocratic'. It has thus been advocated that the 'first party' should always form the government. This would function well with secret vote mechanism.

Change of parties by candidates: COP

In a democracy, the change of parties by candidates may be presented as a 'right' of any candidate of a political party as it is practiced in many countries. The first fact they would forget is that 'democracy' is for the citizen and not for the candidate. The candidate is, on the other hand, under obligation to comply to the 'democracy norms' towards the citizen. If he/she has succeeded in elections as representative of a party, it would be 'abuse' to the citizen support if the candidate would change the party after election. And why a candidate would change party. Was he a stupid earlier or got 'enlightened' about the party he/she proposes to join miraculously. Neither of these. The fact which would come out is that he/she was a MUBI and he/she is a MUBI just working for 'selfish gains'. As advocated, the formation of government by the largest party with adoption of 'minimum differential of votes' and 'secret voting' would just eliminate all the incentives anyone would have to change the party after elections.