

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.

INDEPENDENCE : Analysing Meaningfulness

MI-Meaningful Independence; MAR-Monarch and Ruler; GPP-Government people and position

1. Independence in a country has many definition, versions, explanations, rationales and perceptions depending upon the 'provider of independence' and 'recipient'.

2. There are examples of Monarch/monarchy extract benefits from nation's resources for self-gains and may deprive citizen. Such governance system shall correspond to 'Masterism' in governance.

3. Monarch strategy may be to acquire more land and people but keep citizen poor, hungry, illiterate, disintegrated so that they remain undemanding and powerless.

4. Having a 'ruler' of same breed, race and region is not any sacrosanct condition for 'independence' of nation and citizen?

5. Thus 'freedom of speaking', unregulated and unchecked, is an environment of 'low CEAK' and 'low compliance of citizen's prerequisites' by GPP, shall depreciate the 'Independence' rather than enhancing 'independence' which normally is stated.

6. Independence is to be defined from the citizen's consideration and point of view and not from ruler's. If ruler define and declare independence, it is incorrect. Independence corresponds to the nationals, human beings of the nation and they are, the citizen

7. The difference between relative position between the monarch/ruler and the average citizen would be a parameter to define the independence of citizen. Higher is the difference, indicates depreciated independence' of the citizen.

8. Ruler/monarch/government must have certain predefined and pre-notified duties and objectives for citizen welfare and these must be complied by government/ruler consistently.

9. Monarch/Government must proclaim/notify the verifiable and measurable 'objectives/aims' which are due to citizen and consequently extent of delivering results would be the 'symbol of citizen's independence'. The governments/GPP, on the same lines becomes accountable to proclaim and provide 'citizen' what is due to them.

10. What is due to 'citizen' are 'citizen prerequisites' and consists of, crime-free environment, healthy living, rising education, development with more opportunities and trust worthy public services/amenities, security, financial ability, uniformity of energy level in society, equality of law & order to rulers and citizen and fast delivery of justice, transparency/sincerity in government working, citizen empowerment to speak against ruler/government. The continuous improvements and upgradation would correspond to citizen 'independence'.

11. Getting 'what is due' i.e. 'citizen's prerequisites' is even more important than 'freedom of expression', so the basic requirement of 'independence' is GPP's proclamation/presentation of yielding 'citizen's prerequisites' in verifiable and measurable DAVM terms consistently.

12. Government people are 'deputed representatives of the citizen/people' to 'manage the nation' and should 'present themselves as one of them' and not the 'ruler'. So the behaviour of government people becomes an important parameter to measure the 'environment of citizen independence'.

13. The madiak shall be dutiful to bring out that Government/GPP are meeting with the goals/aims in DAVM terms, as regards to 'citizen prerequisites' in 'verified and certified' parameters.

14. The madiak should invariably notify the 'undue gains' being 'possessed' by GPP from 'nation's resources'.

Independence of a nation has many definition, versions, explanations, rationales and perceptions depending upon the 'provider of independence' and 'recipient'. Starting from 'any presumed version of independence', therefore, may be misleading. Let we look at the other side.

Native vs Foreigner:

What is reverse of independence? Ruled by those who may not consider the subjects as belonging to them, responsibly and sentimentally. The most common derivation of this rationale as known, is 'Ruled by foreigners' those who do not belong to the land? And who would recognize the identity of the people who are ruling, that they are foreigner, obviously the people of the 'land'. So independence would be the term which would correspond to the dwellers, **Thus Independence corresponds to the nationals, human beings of the nation. Independence as commonly known therefore, would represent the feeling of the nationals that they are being governed and controlled by those who are from their society and breed.**

Why the people believed that the ruler should be of their 'race' and 'origin' (may be termed as 'native monarch' NM). The contention would have been that the NM, would remain permanent on the land with them (citizen) and therefore, shall spare its attention and care for their(citizen's) welfare. And an 'foreigner monarch'/Ruler FM shall come with the inclination of 'temporarily' staying, governing over the people and extracting the benefits from the 'resources' of the land for self and for the people and place it originally belongs to. What would ruler do with the resources? The native monarch was expected to disperse the benefits of resources to the people. Even if the NM would not transfer benefits of resources to the people, which means that it would extract benefits of resources only to the extent needed by itself, the resources at least

would remain with them. Whereas in case of FM, the benefit of resources shall be extracted and transferred to its place of origin, where it belongs to. May be **this was the reasoning for having 'ruler of the same origin' to define 'independence'**. But the meaningful independence-MI would be low because the citizen not getting what is due to them.

However is it the condition which adequately and correctly represents 'independence of a nation and the citizen?'. Let we call it presumption1 and analyse further.

Today most nations have the governments systems managed by the people who are selected by the citizen of the nation. This system evolved from the systems which existed in the past.

Going back to the past, there were monarchs, used to govern over the people. Many such domains staged that monarch would be one person deriving benefit from the vast resources of land and the people normally would not pose any challenge for its actions. There would be no incentive for the king to distribute the benefits of the nation's resources to all the people and thus to the extent possible, may assign the benefits to self. The **monarch would normally be from the same race, breed and society but may not sharing benefits of resources to the people. And people were helpless, not to react, keep submissive and silent. The monarchs would apply authority and muscle power to keep the people silent and submissive.** But monarch not providing the citizens their share of prosperity and resources. However **the nations (kingdoms) were considered independent and citizen were made to believe that 'only kingdom's existence (independence) is 'their (citizen's) independence'.** The people were being ruled by the monarch of the same race and breed but not providing means and opportunities to prosper. It was not possible for the common citizen to speak about its rights and what wrong was being done by the monarch. **So the people were not independent as they were not being provided due share from 'nation's resources' and also their voice was not being heard especially regarding their rights and 'if monarch's action adequately represented 'citizen welfare'. So the monarch stands like a 'master' and a master would make others 'slave' for its survival.**

So the first condition of 'independence' is that 'citizen' get due share from nation's resources and they have authority to question the 'ruler' about its actions to evidence ruler's responsibility and ownership towards 'citizen welfare'.

Why the ruler would need the people. The economic consideration, tax. **Ruler to take away a part of whatever they have as revenues, as tax. And ruler would decide the 'size of tax' and it would not correspond to the paying capacity of the citizen.** This will also put a constraint of arranging the livelihood round the clock, thus not having spare time and non interfering with the ruler. However, most important criteria would be size, population. The land do not speak, but the people do. **If there are people telling that they belong to someone, the empire gets extended upto that place by itself. So the people would represent the size of empire.** This would be a very important criteria for understanding the relation between ruler and those being ruled. **More people, easy to keep control over a big size of land, more resources and more people to tell outsiders that they are part of the nation and bigger is the size of empire.**

The tax being paid by citizen should correspond to the 'quantum of welfare' extended by the 'ruler.

The larger size of population has great risk factor also. If united, they can pose a threat to the ruler. **The ruler's strategy therefore, may be to keep them poor, hungry, illiterate, disintegrated so that they remain undemanding and powerless.** The survival of the monarch depends upon that the people remain so poor that they keep on dreaming to arrange meals for themselves everyday. And adding illiteracy to it, so that they do not understand what is happening on the globe around them and remain unfit for anything else except serving the role of a poor citizen of the nation. **This is a model which would be preferably followed by a ruler bearing 'masterism' on one hand and resulting poor, illiterate and powerless people on the other hand.** However, in this situation also, can the people be said to be independent? No.

The Monarch (and Ruler)MAR, shall extract benefits from nation's resources for self and therefore, would upgrade its 'living standards, life style and assets'. The Monarch shall have Palace to live, own high end and expensive assets, ornaments, gold, jewel, valuables, property and there will be significant gap between his/her assets value compared to assets of a common citizen. Theoretically, the MAR should have assets at par with a common citizen for high meaningful independence-MI. Let value of assets of a common person is 'V1' and the population is 'P'. The MAR shall have assets open to public like palace, vehicles, industries/business etc, however MAR shall make efforts to keep assets hidden also. Say value of assets of MAR is 'Vm'. Ideally this Vm was to be owned by the people of the nation/citizen. So the ratio of V_m/V_1 shall indicate the independence level. However, to manage a nation/country, the ruler has to be more powerful and authoritative compared to citizen, to an extent required to keep the people disciplined and coherent. So V_m/V_1 would be a positive figure. However, **Vm must not increase with time, whereas V1 should increase, so V_m/V_1 must come down with time.**

Endorsing Independence

This also gives birth to an important analogy. **The difference between relative position between the rulers and the average citizen would be a parameter to define the independence of citizen. Higher is the difference, indicates depreciated independence' of the citizen.** If the ruler is living like common person, then the 'independence is high'. The difference can be judged on economic, social and power terms. **Let we term it as Rule1.**

The citizen have the existence associated with the Monarch and monarch is not interfering in their lives every day. Can this be rated as independence to the people? If it is so, every monarchy would have been an independent state and the governance should not have transformed from monarch to its other forms as visible today and termed as 'democracy', implying 'citizen's rule'. The wrong in it is that monarch would have no incentive to do good to the people and the state would not develop in a manner to provide direct benefits to the citizens.

In this case, the ruler is independent in actions, decisions and implementation, but citizen are not. They have no discretion not to follow ruler's unruly decisions and not to safe guard themselves from ruler's actions if it doesn't favour the citizen. Although monarch would proclaim it to be 'independence', it would not represent independence from citizen point of view. **An important analogy emerges here is that independence is to be defined from the citizen's consideration and point of view and not from ruler's point of view, let we term it as Rule2. The ruler is always free to present anything as 'independence' being powerful and resourceful but citizens viewpoint may not coincide. It is of specific importance as normally the ruler define and declare 'independence' of the citizen which therefore, is incorrect.**

Looking from the citizen side, the prerequisites of independence would be that the ruler must provide internal and external security, healthy environment and worth living conditions, opportunities to upgrade intelligence and awareness, productive business environment, minimum assured earnings, integrated social set up, evils free society, equality in society, adherence of laws and rules supporting these factors, safety and security within the society etc **and the truthful, sincere and transparent behavior from ruler for 'optimum citizen welafare'. The monarch would normally not assign these attributes to the definition of independence as these would assign responsibility and accountability to the ruler itself.** However, these attributes would be necessity if looking at independence from citizen point of view or for 'citizen-independence'.

The important conclusion of this premise is that 'independence' is to be defined and justified by the citizen and not by the ruler. What would it mean? It implies that the Ruler/monarch/government must have certain predefined and pre-notified duties and objectives for citizen welfare and these must be complied by government/ruler consistently. Let we term it as Rule3.

Present Governance

In present governance system, there are HOG-Head of the Government, MOG- Members of the Government and many countries are ruled by their own nationals, or the governments which consists of the people from same nation. Also there are examples of countries which have the top person or HOG or MOG having foreign origin or different race than the nationals of that country. However, the nations may be progressing and developing irrespective of the 'origin' or 'race' of the HOG or the people in the government. Or the HOG is of same race or origin but still the nation is not coming up or developing satisfactorily. It is explained in other chapter that government people would normally be behaving driven by their human attributes including insecurity and selfish self-gains. And this **may** turn GPP(Government people) into masterism, GPP/rulers dictating their terms and do not provide adequate support to the citizen, further turning them into 'slaves'. It is explained in other chapter that HOG, MOG/GPP are not super-persons. They are ordinary persons with assigned duties of 'super-person' thus they may tend to play tricks, hoodwink and authority to keep people promised and lost and scared. All such attributes are the 'presentation of masterism' by the ruler/GPP, HOG, MOG. Therefore, **the**

HOG, MOG would fall into 'masterism' because of their intents of 'selfish self-gains' and not because of the 'race, breed, origin of nationality'.

And these nations are claimed to be independent simply because the land is ruled by their own nationals. Are the people independent? The **situation thus happens to be parallel to the one having the 'monarch' not displaying 'sincere ownership' and 'responsibility for citizen welfare'. And thus the citizen/people are not 'independent'.**

It is therefore, necessary to refresh what the 'independence of a nation and the citizen' would mean.

Redefine Independence

Although in above examples the people are ruled by 'their own people' but they are not being provided benefits from the 'nation's resources'. So they would not be contented, prosper and happy. And they are not able to express their problems and get due solutions. It is important to note that if the people were happy and getting their dues, they would not have urged to speak or express and remain contented.

As elaborated above under 'endorsing independence' Rule2 &3; monarch was stated to be 'right or wrong', 'good or bad' by virtue of its actions to provide the requisite 'prosperity, avenues to develop, security' and 'imparting sincere attention to their grievances' especially due to the 'monarch's actions'. **If the monarch was dutiful, it would have proclaimed these as the 'objectives which are due to citizen' and consequently this would be the 'symbol of citizen's independence'. The government/GPP, on the same lines becomes accountable to proclaim and provide 'citizen' what is due to them.**

In any nation, **the citizen would need (citizen's prerequisites):**

- i. **crime-free environment,**
- ii. **healthy living,**
- iii. **rising education,**
- iv. **Development: with more opportunities, trustworthy public services**
- v. **security,**
- vi. **financial ability and growth corresponding to GPP,**
- vii. **uniformity of energy level in society,**
- viii. **equality of law & order to rulers and citizen and fast delivery of justice,**
- ix. **transparency in dealings of nation's resources,**
- x. **transparency in GPP/Government working,**
- xi. **citizen ability/empowerment to speak against ruler/government and 'government responding truthfully'.**

Providing these to the citizen, adequately and meaningfully, shall correspond to the 'independence' of the citizen and 'nation'

The sincere government would notify the improvements aimed at and achieved every six months. **The continuous improvements and upgradation would correspond to citizen independence.**

Many **government/GPP would provide freedom of 'speaking anything' to the people and present this to them 'as independence'**. The people, especially in an environment which is 'scarce of opportunities to develop' resulting consequently people 'taking over 'other's shares' for their 'survival and benefits', shall speak against 'one another's interests' and thus would 'collide with others'. The citizen would 'collide with one another' thus looking upto the GPP for 'intervention and mediation' making GPP free of 'citizen's prerequisites' as citizen would lose 'focus on citizen's prerequisites' now which should have been paramount priority. It would suit to the GPP and thus 'liberty of expression shall have much more emphasis than any other items of 'citizen's prerequisites'. With undue liberty of expression, there shall be quarrelsome society, people fighting and arguing for petty issues like someone laughed at other, vehicle overtaking etc and people using abusive language in public shall be visible. GPP would just encourage such trend by ignoring. This would further enhance the non-major crimes occurrence obviously converting some of these and resulting to major crimes. This state shall automatically bring GPP to 'masterism' and citizen to 'slave'. The 'citizen's prerequisites' shall got lost and thus such state shall not correspond to 'Independence'. **Thus concept of 'freedom of speaking', unregulated and unchecked, in an environment of 'low CEAK' and 'low compliance of citizen's prerequisites' by the government/GPP, shall depreciate the 'Independence' rather than enhancing 'independence' which normally is stated.**

Thus getting 'what is due- citizen's prerequisites' is even more important than 'expression'. **So we consider the basic requirement of being 'independent' as GPP's proclamation/presentation of 'citizen's prerequisites' in verifiable and measurable DAVM terms.** Therefore, the independence of a country should correspond to the fact as to how much one gets in a country to 'what is due to them' viz 'citizen's prerequisites'.

The ruler/government must present their sincere intention to citizen to specify the services, amenities support which are due to them from government, in DAVM terms and notify and present the 'certified, verified achievements' consistently.

So from an undefined or vague and inadequately defined term 'independence' by the master', a defined and meaningful term has been worked out. For better understanding, it need to be 'named' differently. Let this be called 'Meaningful Independence-MI'. Therefore, it is MI what would state the extent of independence of a country/citizen rather than vague and undefined term, may be normally presented by the 'government'/GPP.

The MI index which can be calculated as under, would reflect the real extent of 'independence' of a country:

MI Index= what is available to citizen(DAVM)/ what is due to citizen(DAVM)

Monarch, as evidenced adequately by the past history of civilization, would not do much for the MI Independence of the people, a new type of 'nation's management' emerged in which people would elect representatives who collectively and jointly take the position of the ruler. The expression that they take the position of the ruler would be 'incorrect' as if so, the purpose of deployment of 'representatives' shall become invalid. **They are the deputed 'representatives of the citizen/people' to 'manage the nation', government, and should 'present themselves as one of them' and not the 'ruler'.** However, they are the human being, as monarch is in previous example, and probability that they behave like a monarch, exists. **So the behaviour of government people becomes an important parameter to measure the 'environment of citizen independence'.**

The citizen are scattered and 'occupied in daily tussles' of life and not in a position to 'analyse and comment' upon the working of GPP. The role of 'madiak' thus becomes paramount important. It is elaborated in 'madiak/media' chapter that the madiak must act as 'representative of the people/citizen' and not the Government/GPP. **The state of 'madiak' in respect of 'MADISM' and SCAM', would thus be directly 'relates to' the 'citizen independence'.** The negative value of these attributes of the 'madiak' shall exhibit a state with 'low value of citizen independence'. The RAA value of madiak should be high to signify high value of 'citizen independence'. **The madiak shall be dutiful to bring out that Government/GPP are meeting with the goals/aims in DAVM terms, as regards to 'citizen prerequisites' in 'verified and certified' parameters. The madiak should invariably notify the 'undue gains' being 'possessed' by GPP from 'nation's resources'.**

This present governance system is commonly called 'democracy'. The 'Democracy' has been elaborated in other chapter.

The average citizen score and citizen authority score shall represent if the citizen are on the course of development and prospering.
