

10 COMMANDMENTS

Citizens to the State



Yiannis Laouris

Cyprus 2013

10 COMMANDMENTS

Citizens to the State

-

Yiannis Laouris

Copyright © 2012, 2013 Yiannis Laouris
Cyprus 2013
All rights reserved
ISBN-13: 978-9963-9992-1-7

Cover design: Dmytro Smaglov
The rights to the cover image were purchased from
to123rf.com

DEDICATION

To my father, for teaching me the value of morality, justice, and liberty, and to my father-in-law, for inspiring me to study the ancient Greeks, who gave birth to the concepts of democracy and good governance.

Table of Contents

Author's Preface	1
Introduction	3
1st Commandment: The unethical behavior of officials is a criminal offence	7
2nd Commandment: The pursuit of political office requires knowledge	11
3rd Commandment: Senior officials' positions, votes, and bills must be published and filed	17
4th Commandment: The servants of the state should not be overcompensated	21
5th Commandment: The state is not a business	25
6th Commandment: Life-long stability in the public sector is not guaranteed	29
7th Commandment: Direct broadcast of all sessions of the Parliament	33
8th Commandment: Everything up-front	37
9th Commandment: Reforms only through structured democratic dialogue	43
10th Commandment: Reforms made based on an agreed road map	51
Beyond the Commandments: Continuous measures for the evolution of democracy	55
From "Commandments" to action	61
About the author	65

Author's Preface

This short dissertation is a collection of thoughts garnered from many thinkers and intellectuals. I do not seek to claim ownership over these ideas. I simply attempt to express in words the contemplations, desires, and demands of those with whom I have had the good fortune to share social dialogue.

It is not my intention to renounce myself of my responsibilities, nor do I wish to pursue a role beyond that of an average, active citizen. I am simply one who does not marvel at and claim inheritance to the great works, ideas, and important contributions of the ancient forefathers of humanity. On the contrary, I believe that ordinary folks of every era constantly have ideas, visions, and solutions in their minds that could change the world for the better. Unfortunately, today's political and national status quo not only fails to cultivate the conditions necessary for the expression, refinement, and deliberation of such ideas, but in many cases (sometimes even actively) persecutes and obliterates such conditions before public expression can occur. With the global politico-economic crisis increasingly spiraling out of control, I hope to contribute to the contemplation and dialectic that has begun not only in my country of Cyprus, but also in the global community. It is my hope

that this dialectic will result in the birth of a new system of governance and management, or at least compel a fundamental upgrade of the system toward something that is more efficient and more relevant to the current context. Even though this treatise was originally written in Greek in December of 2011 with the aim to intervene in the happenings within my homeland, I believe that the analyses, critiques, and commandments of the average citizen to political leaders may be of global value.

In some cases, the ideas and thoughts expressed may be of an allegorical or metaphorical nature. In other cases, I tried to uphold my reasoning using concepts drawn from the world of science, but I will not claim that these attempts are comprehensive or rigidly scientific. The final goal is simply to challenge readers to widen their scope of thinking in order to develop their own relevant logical arguments. It is the responsibility of readers to refine their ideas, to broaden these ideas' applicability and meanings, to discuss and deliberate with others, to be perplexed, and to agree or disagree. I am not, under any circumstances, claiming that the ideas discussed herein are complete or perfect.

In the best case, the thoughts developed within this short document might be acknowledged as general "commandments," which many citizens may already wish to be applied to those who have offered to serve the commons.

Introduction

Over the past several years, the nations of the Western world have witnessed an unprecedented political and economic crisis. While most philosophers and analysts lay the responsibility for this crisis upon the practices of globalization, the wisdom of ordinary citizens points the blame decisively and exclusively toward what they perceive to be a crisis of values within political institutions, or the erosion of ethics among public servants. This has facilitated the rise of corruption responsible for the collapse of the global economic system and for the evident crisis of our current system of governance.

The collapse of our economic and political institutions is not the *cause* of global political and cultural decline, but it is the *consequence*.

Younger generations are no longer making the effort to stay informed, nor are they participating in the political developments taking place in the world around them. This results in a lack of democratic conscience or responsibility. Many political analysts, especially politicians, shamelessly accuse the young citizenry of being pathetic. However, the root cause of this alienation is not a lack of interest but a lack of opportunities, of transparency, and of

means that would allow authentic participation in the commons. It is becoming very clear that not only the younger citizens but society at large is voicing in a multitude of ways and on a daily basis its aversion for the political inertia and corruption evident in all spheres of life. They point to the corrupted politicians and regulators as responsible parties. People do not hesitate to even sacrifice their right to vote; as the vote has evolved to nothing more than a symbolic function of democracy, it is no great hardship to cast it aside in protest against this unprecedented political decline.

It is more than evident that those who enjoy themselves at the banquet of power participate in election campaigns and promote themselves in order to further their personal interests. It is widely believed that the so-called politicians long-ago ceased to function within the boundaries of ethics and morality; indeed, they no longer even care to keep up the pretense of morality. They do not hesitate to lie and distort the truth, even when speaking publically to their own supporters. The painfully obvious tactic of promoting individuals only of their own ideology or of their own private circle of acquaintances only perpetuates a culture of dishonesty and corruption. There is no oppression worse than that which functions behind the shadows of the legal system and under the pretense of justice.

In an age of such sociopolitical decline, the right to vote is no longer an adequate means of resistance. Contemplation and dialogue are key. With this as a guiding light, I decided to document my thoughts in order for them to serve as an answer for those politicians who, instead of assuming their responsibilities, prefer to urge any citizen who wishes to be active to join a political party or institution and run for office at the next election.

The “Commandments” are not the result of strenuous research. They have not succumbed to the vigorous tests of the scientific process, nor have they undergone sensitivity analysis or influence testing. They are not fanciful suggestions, either. They are the result of life-long reflections and contemplation of the current global state of affairs, in conjunction with the daily experience gained through observation, through systemic analyses, and through discussing these matters with fellow citizens, as they are the true source of prudence and wisdom. This dissertation will have achieved its goals if the Commandments generate momentum for a wide-scale and productive discussion about government. Within such deliberation lies the only hope for the people to crystallize their thoughts about the inadequacies of today’s systems of government. Thereby, the characteristics of a new model of democracy will appear.

1st Commandment: The unethical behavior of officials is a criminal offence

Although many have made it their goal to convince us that the concepts of ethics and deontology are relative, subjective, and essentially debatable, we know what is truly right and what is wrong. Since ancient times, philosophers have put forth universal principles of morality that can be applied, even today, to act as a moral compass. For example, Heraclitus claimed, "Ethics define each man's destiny," and Solon demanded, "Do not tell lies, but the truth." Pythagoras formulated maxims such as, "Do not swear upon the Gods but instead take care that you yourselves are reliable" and "Choose to live virtuously." Plato reminds us that "there are both written and unwritten laws." Pittacus recommended that we "behave respectfully" and proclaimed, "We must not speak ill of our friends, nor of our enemies." According to Democritus, "He who honors virtue, honors first the truth, and thus considers it to be the master of everything good"; Democritus also formulated the opinion that "a life without virtue, wisdom, common sense, and respect is not a bad life but instead a prolonged death." Aristotle insisted that "education and the application of virtue lead, above all, to an honorable life," while Heraclitus argued that "instead of all

the mortal things, the finest among us choose only one: Eternal Glory. In contrast, most settle with becoming full and grow fat like beasts.”

The values projected through the ruses of these ancient philosophers contribute to our attempts to behave and function ethically and righteously. When someone does not respect these values, he or she, first and foremost, fails to achieve self-realization, which is perhaps a matter of personal choice. However, the secondary effect of ignoring these values is likely to be harm done to the rest of the world. Thus, immoral behavior contributes to mass ignorance and sociopolitical decay. It is certainly not anyone’s right to act immorally, if his or her behavior results in the destruction of people and systems.

Those who serve the state have an even stronger obligation to follow these universal values, as their actions affect a greater number of people and systems. After all, the basic characteristic of a democratic government is its duty to serve the interests of all citizens. This means that every officer of the state is obliged to serve and act in the interests of the whole of society, and not the exclusive interests of some of its parts.

Now that we have placed the problem upon its proper foundations, the persistent student must return to the beginning of the chapter and read the quotes and maxims once more, with a much more critical disposition. Do the politicians of our times use the moral values mentioned

above as an ethical compass? Unfortunately, there come to mind dozens of daily examples that would suggest otherwise.

In order to achieve and guarantee a gradual evolution toward a better world, we must formulate a legal system that will fully deter the servants of the state from acting immorally. Furthermore, the punishment of violators must be just, strict, and exemplary.

State officials who interfere in processes such as the appointment of officers or requests for government tenders and those who use their positions to achieve personal benefit quite commonly receive no punishment for their actions. This is not just because of a disinclination to investigate this behavior; there exists a web of interests and fear that effectively deters witnesses from reporting such incidents.

Most leaders are elected because they have influential parents, because they are rich, or because they practice a profession that favors them. Imagine a political leader who, even after his or her election to the highest office in the country, still heads a colossal mass media empire that projects his or her own agenda in the form of propaganda. Under such conditions, what chances would any political opponents have to express and support their positions? Imagine a situation where a distinguished lawyer is elected to be the head of state and, further down the line,

a citizen is defending him or herself in Court against the head of state. Let's finally suppose that a top-ranking official commits a crime. Even in cases where the police become aware that extreme crimes have been committed, the individuals involved are almost always protected by political asylum. Most worrying is the fact that the above scenarios, and worse, are actually taking place in many countries.

Political corruption has managed to convince the average citizen that corruption is a natural phenomenon within any society and that nothing can be done to stop it. This position is false. Fortunately, the younger citizens of such countries are recognizing and formally expressing their detestation of such behaviors. The power of the people can generate a lot of changes within a society, as long as the people are able to realize the irrationality and immorality of the current situation and formulate demands that function as specific "Commandments" for those who govern.

The 1st political commandment states that all of the situations mentioned above (and many more, which will have to be carefully documented) constitute criminal offences and must be punishable and punished by law. The political asylum of state officers must be either completely nullified or revoked if a reasonable number of signatures are collected by the citizens.

2nd Commandment: The pursuit of political office requires knowledge

In Ancient Athens, the members of the Council of Five Hundred were not elected but were appointed through a simple draw. The state considered that every citizen had an obligation to be engaged in the problems of the commons, that each should know and respect the state's laws and moral principles, and that each should be willing to take an active role in the governing of his country. The ancient Greeks also held the belief that it did not require anything more than common sense, simple wisdom, and a steady set of ethical principles to govern justly and democratically. Interest in discussing and debating with others who held differing opinions was the cornerstone of the commonly accepted methodology for the investigation and analysis of the problems plaguing the state; such discussions were the means by which possible choices were defined in order for the Council to achieve a consensus. But is such an approach possible under today's circumstances? Is the average citizen in a position to assume political office without any relevant education or training?

An answer of "yes" would be based on daily experience and the observation that those who are elected through

“democratic” parliamentary procedures, as well as those who are elected and appointed by the “fair” procedures of the executive powers, do not necessarily have a better understanding of the state’s problems, nor do they possess a higher education or skill level than the average citizen. However, just because currently untrained and unskilled people are receiving political office does not justify the placement of incompetent people in vital positions. On the contrary. Rather than conceding that those who hold office may be incompetent, we must ensure that the individuals who assume positions in the state apparatus have the necessary knowledge and skills to observe their duties.

This is because the problems faced by today’s societies are much more complicated than those faced by the ancients, and even by societies a century ago or a few decades ago. The Greek-American scientist Aleco Christakis, founder of the science of structure dialogic design, found that the complexity of the socio-political problems faced by the councils of Ancient Athens were one order of magnitude smaller than those that we face today; thus, the knowledge required to tackle our contemporary problems is greater than it used to be. Because the average citizen does not often possess such knowledge, and the time it would take to learn the necessary knowledge would be detrimental to the performance of the government system, we must take certain measures and consider alternative

approaches to ensure that political officials are educated and informed.

Basic Education

Our representatives in government must be prepared to take their office. Consider the fact that a clerk at a governmental post office must pass a series of examinations to be eligible for the position, and that ordinary citizens must pass an examination to operate a motor vehicle, while in many countries no examination or certification is required for someone to serve in parliament or take the helm of state.

We must require that citizens seeking candidacy for political office must pass certain examinations before they can even pursue a position in the state. Beyond the basic knowledge required for the position that they might assume, they should also be educated in the principles of modern democratic culture and the application of moral and ethical principles to government.

In order to pass this exam, all those who desire to take part in the commons should be obligated to undergo educational courses before and during their terms of office. Without such a measure, those who have intimate knowledge of the workings of government will monopolize the state's structural, scientific, governmental, and social

workings. Without such a measure, those who take a position that they are unprepared for will fail to serve their fellow citizens, prolong the status quo, support mediocrity, increase discontent, and propel the youth toward indifference.

Specific Expertise

In addition to personal education, politicians could benefit from receiving training for the use of specialized tools and practices. As we mentioned above, most average citizens do not possess the knowledge needed to perform in office. Consequently, it is necessary that those holding political office should request the help of others. Someone would expect that the “wise” who offer to serve the commons would have the humility to ask for the help and cooperation of those who are experts in specialized matters. Day-to-day experience, however, shows that officials are unwilling to seek expert opinions. We do not know if this is due to intolerance, selfishness, pride, or the desire to exploit situations for personal benefit.

It is the duty of each political official to seek the assistance and opinions of specialists and experts in matters where their knowledge falls short. Each official should construct a setting that fosters social debate about issues and constructive criticism of solutions, through which new and better ideas may be forged and then enacted. Cer-

tainly, the concept of public consultation has gained ground over the past few years, as more governments and politicians invite citizens to submit their opinions. However, we must insist that a simple consultation or trade of opinions is not enough. Contemporary societies require the utilization of a structured, dialogic design process, which will help the government to glean the greatest possible benefits from the collective wisdom of the citizenry.

The state cannot trust that the good will and humility of each civil servant will be enough to ensure consultation when it is necessary. On the contrary, the state must institutionalize and cultivate the means with which the desired result may be achieved.

Citizens want modern legislators to embrace Heraclitus's assertion that "it is better to conceal your ignorance rather than reveal it everywhere"; that is, legislators must not spread their ignorance everywhere through making uninformed decisions that affect everyone. They should adopt measures that guarantee that they will be guided by purely positive goals, ensure that they possess the necessary basic knowledge to perform job functions, and exploit the knowledge of experts in order to create a framework of institutions that permits the creative and democratic use of society's intellectual resources and collective wisdom.

3rd Commandment: Senior officials' positions, votes, and bills must be published and filed

Democracy can be defined as a system of government in which administrative power stems from the people, is exercised by the people, and serves the common interests of the people. The defining characteristic of democracy is that decisions are made through a voting procedure. In the case of direct democracy, the votes are cast by the citizens. In a representative democracy, which is the dominant form of most democratic states today, the votes are cast by the representatives of the people. However, it is possible that the representatives elected by the people will not actually support the positions on which their election was based.

Before we investigate this problem more thoroughly, it is important to recognize certain deficiencies in today's democratic system. Democracy is not only characterized by the institution of voting as the primary tool for decision-making, it is also characterized by the division of powers into legislative, executive, and judicial branches. While the legislative power is responsible for the generation of laws, the executive power is responsible for the supervision of

the proper execution of laws. The parliament has the responsibility to create legislation that controls the government. In most countries, however, it is the case that a single governing party has total control of both the executive power and the parliament. This creates a government wherein a single ideology is in a position to rule and legislate. In this situation, the existence of different opinions and priorities among members of the same political factions can be extremely important. It is absolutely normal that people who belong to the same political group have differing opinions and priorities. After all, that is why we vote on individuals, not just parties. This gives citizens the opportunity to favor a candidate based on his or her stance on relevant issues. It is therefore natural that citizens should expect that their representatives will support the opinions by which they were elected. But what often happens is that a representative instead falls victim to the tyranny of the opinions held by the party majority.

The tragedy is that the citizens do not protest, either because they are similarly “trapped” into agreement with their political parties, or because they are not informed about the choices that their representatives make. The day-to-day, two-faced nature of some politicians can also worsen the situation—many politicians say one thing to the people but vote otherwise in parliament. The only reasonable solution to the problem of voter misinformation on this point is the *immediate, direct publication of the specific positions, choices, and votes of representatives.*

We live in a digital age, wherein information can be shared and transferred in an instant. It is inexcusable for information on representatives' choices to be unavailable. Rather, information should be shared and easily refined. Citizens should not simply be given access to relevant data, but should also have the means to filter and compare this data in a meaningful way.

The above arrangements will give citizens powerful tools that will permit them to observe and evaluate the behaviors and contributions of their representatives and hold representatives accountable for their parliamentary decisions. However, these alone are not enough. In many places, citizens are deprived of the right to favor a representative of the party for which they are not registered, even in the form of a weighted vote. This problem can be solved only if horizontal voting is adopted. The majority of politically active citizens demand the implementation of a horizontal vote, but because it is in the interest of political parties to maintain control of the elective procedure, the status quo remains.

Beyond the above proposals, it is also necessary that a safety mechanism be put in place to guarantee the proper role of the legislator. Thus, a legislator who does not legislate should not be allowed to run for re-election.

To this end, it is necessary that some criteria be put in place in order to evaluate the contribution and productivity

Yiannis Laouris

of each representative in regards to their role as a legislator.

4th Commandment: The servants of the state should not be overcompensated

Let us remind ourselves of the conditions within which the first statesmen came to be. Let us consider the example of the first hunters. Our cave-dwelling primogenitures depended not only on their bravery in order to hunt; they also, and perhaps more so, depended on their sharpened spears. As a consequence, each hunter put great care into the design, materials, and construction of his or her spear, since this item determined not only success in securing food, but also helped guarantee personal safety.

However, when families began to organize themselves into nomadic groups, they began to assign the production of spears to artisans. In this way, early human societies delegated certain roles and contributions to certain individuals in order to meet to the needs of the whole and capitalize on each individual's talents and skills. It is reasonable to assume that the role of the *spear-artisan* would be assigned to an individual who was less athletic and possibly less brave. On the other hand, the role of *spear-manager*—the individual who managed the spears and decided the hunting strategy—was more likely to be given

to an individual capable of observing the physical condition of each hunter and determining who was most fit to attack. An equally important criterion for the selection of the *spear-manager* would of course also be a matter of trust that he or she would be ethical, just, and offer equal opportunities to all the hunters in order for them to secure food for their families.

These first *spear-artisans* and *spear-managers* constitute the primal form of the governmental machine. Their role was to serve the interests of the whole through the design and management of the time and property of the whole.

Let's imagine what would happen if, during the distribution of food following a hunt, the leader of the group decided that the *spear-artisans* and *spear-managers* would receive more food than the hunters. This primitive form of interpersonal exploitation would not only be unfair, it would not be sustainable. If they do not receive a fair share of the food, the hunters would not be motivated to hunt. In order to survive and feed their families, they would either rebel against the group or abandon it, resulting in the *spear-artisans* and *spear-managers* having an abundance of excellent spears and profitable arrangements, but no hunters!

In today's society, if our equivalent of *spear-artisans* and *spear-managers* do not serve the labor of the hunters in a way that is just—if the benefits that they enjoy as “servants” of the hunters are more than what common sense

would allow, especially if they are provocatively better paid than the hunters, everyone would prefer to be *spear-artisans* and *spear-managers*. The pool of hunters would be greatly diminished, and how then would the viability of the group be secured? The result would be a perfect administrative machine that would be incapable of achieving the goals it was designed to serve. This would lead to the collapse of the administrative machine, as well as the established system of management and benefit distribution.

In order to avoid such a possibility today, we must adopt a Commandment that requires reasonable but not exorbitant compensation and privileges for state officials. If more citizens would prefer to be a servant rather than a hunter, the state machine would collapse.

The current economic crisis has brought to the surface the particular importance of the 4th Commandment. Whether it be citizen or state, an entity that spends more than it earns will not be able to financially support itself for long. Consequently, servants of the state machine should not be overcompensated and the state machine should not be a costly operation.

5th Commandment: The state is not a business

After the end of World War I and especially after the collapse of the so-called socialist states around 1989–1991, a political system was established in the Western world that was founded on the values of liberalism. Liberal Democracy is a representative democracy based on a constitution that allows for the discrimination of powers. It also guarantees that certain individual freedoms exist, for the purpose of minimizing state intervention in the lives of its citizens. The term “liberalism” is interpreted very differently on the east and west sides of the Atlantic, but is generally associated with the protection of individual rights and also the reduction of state-ism. The second meaning of “liberalism” concerns the restriction of state interventions in the economy and the freedom of private initiative.

In order to develop this discussion, let’s borrow from the example of the previous chapter. Imagine what would happen if the *spear-managers* suddenly decided to also participate in hunting. This would certainly make it easier for them to provide more for their families, since they would be allowed a hunter’s portion as well as a manger’s

portion of the game. If they engaged in hunting as an institution, rather than on an individual level, the *spearmanagers* could hire hunters and would therefore be responsible for allocation of the game. Would such a situation be ethically correct? Would it be deemed acceptable by the hunters and the larger social group?

In this over-simplified example, the answer to the above questions is a firm negative. However, if we turn our attention to today's world, we observe many similar phenomena taking place around us, although the absurdity of their existence is not so clearly discernible. For example, those who serve the state, and who, at least in Europe and the countries of the third world, enjoy many privileges as a result, also hold second jobs. Furthermore, we may identify many cases where the state itself enjoys a "second" job that is beyond the purpose for which the government was constituted—where the state essentially takes on the role of an entrepreneur.

It is easy to conclude through these brief reflections that those who assume the role of civil servants cannot at the same time be in competition with those whom they are supposed to serve. In other words, a government's employees should not be allowed to engage in competition with private businesses on the side.

Some would argue that it is illegal for civil servants to have a second job, particularly one that poses a conflict of interest, and thus the solution to such a problem is the

stricter application of the law. However, is it not contradictory that the supervision of the legislature is in the same hands as the executive powers? It is for this reason that we must construct and apply such changes that would by default create further transparency and promote social stability.

Consequently, the 5th Commandment requires that *information regarding the salaries, benefits, and properties of all who serve the state at any level or post should not only be published on an official website, but also renewed on a monthly basis.*

Thus, possible violators would no longer be able to fortify themselves behind the inability (or incompetence) of the state to enforce the relevant laws, and instead would at all times be exposed to public scrutiny.

The second case that we investigated concerned an organized group of *spear-managers* (i.e., the state) who decide to compete with the hunters (i.e., private entrepreneurs). In this case, the situation is more critical since the scale of events is much bigger and consequently it is easier for a crisis to develop.

It is for this reason that in Europe over the past few years, and especially after the Lisbon Treaty, there is an increasing consensus that the state should avoid taking on the role of entrepreneur.

A state that cares about social justice must preserve and fund certain services. For example, we all consider it ethically proper that when someone has an accident and ends up in the emergency room, they must be given adequate medical care regardless of whether they have medical coverage or not. With the same logic, we expect that the national television channel will transmit programs with topics that concern society, regardless of these programs' lack of entertainment value for the general public. We all demand that the state should offer certain services that may not be profitable to provide. The requirement is not that the state should cease such services, but that it should determine the costs and assign them to the best offer.

It is certain that in the context of today's socio-economic framework, the state must be careful about what role it will play. Since it is considered acceptable by most that the role of the state should be restricted to the monitoring and enforcement of the law, it owes it to its citizens that it be careful when it dabbles in business.

6th Commandment: Life-long stability in the public sector is not guaranteed

It is natural and desirable for citizens to aim for a sense of stability in life. We strive for a stable job, stable relationships, and stable daily routines. Children require stable homes and families, and the economy functions well when there is relative stability in the stock exchange.

But is it possible that a sub-system could be considerably more stable than the greater system around it? We may, for instance, wish to forbid our teenage offspring to be out of the house after midnight, but we all know how hard it is to maintain a strict curfew if the teenager's friends do not operate under the same prohibitions, and especially so if there are no larger prohibitions keeping youngsters out of certain late-night establishments. Even though the citizens of one country may be hard at work to provide stability for the good of their nation, a crisis in another country can be detrimental to their goals. Thus, it is not possible to isolate the effects of turbulence in one subsystem from its surrounding subsystems, and vice versa, in the "open system" that is life on Earth.

A lack of stability is not necessarily a negative thing. On the contrary, the creativity and progress that result from instability are necessary prerequisites for a system to adjust and react properly to its environment. We see this in the scientific context of entropy. In an isolated system, entropy is always increasing. When a living organism is isolated from the rest of its environment, it dies and decomposes. Dead matter contains less information and thus less complexity, which results in greater entropy. On the contrary, in an open system, we see a constant stream of progress, with the evolution of increasingly complex life forms. The progress of the abilities and capabilities of higher living systems is characterized by a constant decrease in entropy, which is accompanied by an influx of energy and an increase of the complexity and volume of information that is contained in the more complex life forms. In that way we come to the conclusion that the lack of stability that characterizes open systems is an integral factor of evolution and progress.

We live today in an ecosystem where all the subsystems, whatever they may contain, communicate with and affect each other. The system has all the potential for further development.

Of course, according to Heraclitus, in a world where all is in flux, stable points of reference are absolutely necessary. If society cannot provide a sense of stability through the application of basic ethical principles to individuals,

institutions, and the natural environment, we are in danger of entering a period of great instability and chaos. It is therefore important to identify what should stay unchanged with the passage of time and what should be permitted to change as the passage of time causes the evolution of the wider system. Our society certainly needs to find ways to preserve values such as deontology, ethics, equality, and love. However, it is worth considering that, within the framework of this cosmology, it is not necessary for the state machinery to stay the same in the face of changes in the wider environment. It is a subsystem that persistently demands to act like it belongs to a “closed” and isolated system, under the guise of “past working union victories.”

Imagine what would happen to a frying egg if the cook decided to keep a single part of the egg immobile while the rest kept flowing about in the hot oil. It would not only be impossible to hold the egg immobile, but to attempt it would destroy the integrity of the egg as a whole. In other words, the persistent denial of a subsystem to adjust to environmental changes may result in the complete destruction of the open system.

Given this, it is not rational that the subsystem of those who serve the state and are obligated to serve the viability of the greater system be allowed to deny the changes demanded by the laws of development and entropy.

Yiannis Laouris

The 6th Commandment, which requires that lifelong stability cannot be the privilege of a chosen few and certainly not the privilege of those who serve others, does not go against the principles of any particular philosophical or political system. It simply agrees with and upholds the laws of nature.

Consequently, a civil servant should not remain in a particular position or duty as the result of a “union right”; rather, retaining a public sector job should be the result of productivity, adjustment to new conditions, and constant personal development.

7th Commandment: Direct broadcasting of all sessions of the Parliament

There is a lot of debate lately around the concept of transparency and citizen's rights to directly access information. These issues have even become so important that some elevate them to fundamental rights of citizens. We will consider below the reasons why such a discussion has begun, and whether it is indeed justified to consider the right to information access a fundamental right.

In most countries, meetings of parliamentary assembly, at least on key issues, are being broadcasted live through state television. In almost all cases, however, the camera is located across from him who takes the stand and remains steady and firm in that same position for ten or more hours. Apart from the fact that this is very tedious and therefore detrimental to the viewer, the citizen demands that the broadcasting makes him feel like he is in the room and has access also to body language. The active citizen demands to know who is present and who is absent; who is watching with interest and consideration to others when they speak and who riots, taunts or smokes. All these are important background information to enable everyone to know better and to judge criticize

and possibly punish those who he trusted to represent him.

Of course, in the 21st century it will not have been acceptable to broadcast the meetings just through a TV channel. The technology allows digital signal processing to such an extent that such content can become a really useful tool for developing cognitive sovereignty, achieving deeper understanding, and therefore making it easier for an ordinary active citizen to form an educated opinion.

First of all, one would expect that the whole process will be videotaped and remain accessible online permanently.

Secondly, the citizen (or the interested journalist) should be able to identify with great ease and re-watch a particular speech. It should be possible to identify a specific extract from a speech where the peoples' representative refers to a particular topic. This is very easy if a "time key" is used to encode videos with content and other tags. The use of modern methods and coding systems would allow subsequent detailed investigation since one could isolate longitudinal positions on specific policy issues to support or reject any arguments. It would be useful to mention that the cost for such a function is infinite-minimal and is in no way comparable to the day-to-day (sometimes unnecessary) expenses of a parliament. It will serve the deepening of democracy and the transparency of whatever is being discussed and approved by them. The question is whether the representatives of a state are ready to accept

the same degree of public scrutiny, which they themselves legislate for everyone else.

The legislators, to who we place our hopes to restore our confidence in the principles of morality, ethics and democracy, are obliged to take the above transparency measures not only to best serve the system operation. Even more, they demonstrate in practice that they do not cultivate the decomposition and corruption that characterizes our era. This will only be succeeded if they acquire a full and easy access to anything in the context of their work for the citizen.

8th Commandment: Open access- No closed doors or hidden agendas

The decades that elapsed between 1947, i.e., after the end of World War II, and until the fall of the Berlin Wall on November 11, 1989 are designated as the decades of Cold War espionage. Throughout this period there was never conducted an armed conflict between the U.S. and the USSR. Rather, the "war" took place as a daily struggle and competition in prevailing in areas such as nuclear, industry, and even competition for the conquest of space. In these decades there was a rise of espionage because domination was mainly based on knowledge and information. Research was in great length trustworthy and highly confidential. Gradually, with the consolidation of peace and the development of science, we move to the era in which knowledge and information is widely disseminated or becomes publicly accessible. Scientists publish even the most insignificant discovery or invention in international journals. The formula for making an atomic bomb is now accessible to a high school student. Stability and peace are no longer pursued on the basis of scientific secrets kept carefully hidden, but through commercial exploitation. The balances are based on the principle of checks and balances. Opponents know the weapons and

advantages of each other and this acts as a deterrent to making war. This knowledge is not known only to the military but also to scientists, and journalists and even ordinary citizens. For example, by the year 1957 the International Atomic Energy Agency (International Atomic Energy Agency) was established as an autonomous international intergovernmental organization associated with the UN, under which countries are obliged to notify the deployment of nuclear systems. In other words, in today's world, information is fully accessible and not hidden behind closed doors and hidden agendas. The Americans, Russians, French, and generally all nations that have signed the treaty, not only know the number and location of the warheads of the opponent, but also even have the right to inspect. Each form of competition is not conducted on the basis of secret recipes such as the powder of Coke Cola, but on financial and strategic options. The dispute resolution is based on agreed principles of negotiation and consensus. Someone in China can know how to build iPhones, but the international treaties on intellectual property and patents ultimately prevent the illegal trading.

In order to better develop the argument, we will look at another example. For at least a few decades it has been developed and spread rapidly, the institution of "free software" (open source). This approach is not limited to the case of software, but applies more broadly to other forms of expertise. The important thing here is that the products

of knowledge can be used, copied, studied, modified and redistributed without restrictions. This results in the exponential growth of knowledge, because many experts undertake and collaborate towards further development. Over sixteen million people contribute to the mapping of human knowledge through the development of Wikipedia. This effort is a glaring example of open access to knowledge. In addition, the Open University of Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT Open Course Ware) has all its courses for free through the Internet.

Within such a context, where knowledge is created, multiplied, spread, and made available universally, an unusual kind of social intelligence is being developed. Since the whole of society knows the weapons and the strengths of the opponent, the ordinary citizen can no longer be victim of propaganda. Politicians lose their ability to tell propagandistic lies to their citizens, and citizens are not trapped in timeless propagandas and false cues.

International treaties and realistic approaches may impose specific choices for the good of the country, but this cannot be done because the political leaders are caught in positions and arguments of the past. Imagine the case of a leader who negotiates social or political reforms of major importance, and excludes the public from the dialogue and even keeping them away from developments. He may be found in the unpleasant position, even if achieving the best possible deal, the people to reject it

simply because they have not had the opportunity to monitor and in some ways "participate" in the dialogue and negotiation. In the science of democratic dialogue a relevant axiom states that it is unethical to try to reform a (social) system without the authentic involvement and explicit consent of those whose lives will be affected by the change.

For some, the eighth commandment might sound a bit too extreme because one may worry that direct information on all developments may lead to riots and reactions. In reality, however, this will not happen. The masses may develop into an uncontrolled "mob" when not given the opportunity to participate.

The ordinary citizen requires briefing and information directly rather than through third parties, irrespective whether these might be politicians or journalists. If the political system provides direct transmission on TV of even serious political negotiations, then the views and positions of society will mature. The result will be that the public will develop collective wisdom and will clarify what are the options to a problem, what are realistic options, and what are best strategies.

The implementation of the institution of direct transmission on TV of negotiations on substantive issues will facilitate the work of leaders. They will drain from the need to express a different reasoning when negotiating by what they express when talking with followers of one's own party or

reporters of their own versus opponent of political group or country. Such an approach would significantly release tension from their minds, simplify procedures, and allow the negotiators (and intermediaries) to deal with the substance of a negotiation instead of having to explain developments to their followers or the general public. The acceptance or rejection of positions from the public will help the negotiator to focus his effort on issues that are of value to the people. The fact that a leader will not be able any longer to engage in using different arguments and different language and possibly to mock the people regarding the evolution of a deal, would give him more prestige and create new possibilities. It will compel him to negotiate having in mind the fact that everybody is watching. In that way he can be himself and work with zeal and sincerity.

In a democracy we expect that power originates and is exercised by the people. That is, for a regime to be considered democratic, it should ensure the participation of citizens in political processes, even in serious decision-making processes. In the era of technology, participation should not be limited to elections and referendums, but in daily participation in everything that is happening and affecting the lives of everyone. To be entitled to demand from ordinary young persons and citizens to be active and have a mature outlook on the difficult problems facing society, we must give them full access, even in something as unheard of as the process of

Yiannis Laouris

negotiating major issues. Therefore the application of the 8th Commandment, which requires the state to give all information up front and ensure full transparency and access to all developments, is a necessary prerequisite for genuine participation.

9th Commandment: Reforms only through structured democratic dialogue

In the previous chapter we examined the case where the state decides to implement reforms without the genuine involvement and participation of the people. We mentioned that the science of structured democratic dialogue considers it unethical to try to reform a system without the explicit consent of those whose lives will be affected by the change. Every day experiences show that:

Even if someone tries to change a system without the genuine, honest and effective participation of those whose lives will be affected, the effort is doomed from the outset to failure.

The question that will concern us in this chapter is whether there is a practical way to ensure the authentic participation of many people in a consultation.

In order to better understand why people refuse to accept and embrace reforms rulers decide for them, even when they are obviously in their interest, we propose to take a look at the place where democracy was originally born and borrow a little of the wisdom of the ancients.

Two and a half thousand years ago, the fathers of democracy met at the "Agora" (Αγορά, Greek for market) of ancient Athens and discussed issues that concerned them. The problems of those times were, however, not as complex as they are today. But it is worth the trouble to look at how the ancients exchanged views and how they managed to reach agreements and to take decisions that they all subsequently supported.

The word "Agora" derives from the verb "ageiro"(αγείρω), which means congregate and then plead; in other words speak in public. The etymology reveals the multifaceted role of the ancient market because it was there where the daily life of ancient Athens unfolded. The Agora was the center of government, a place of dialogue on religious matters, moral, political and social, but also the space where entrepreneurs engaged in trade. It was the heart of ancient Athens.

Socrates, one of the most eminent philosophers of ancient Athens, taught his students at the Market. He was not rich, nor descended from an aristocratic family. Socrates, who never wrote anything, liked to start a conversation by pretending not to know anything on the subject, but instead that he was interested to learn. He would formulate a question such as, what is just and what unjust, what is courage and what is cowardice. This approach of discussing a serious topic, i.e. through dialogue, asking simple questions and looking for answers, aimed at finding

the truth, is called dialectic (art). He actually believed that if man learns to use his mind (i.e., the logical thinking) he can then analyze a problem and find the truth for himself. Obviously, if Socrates were alive today, he would criticize our educational systems that they find satisfaction by delivering preset knowledge. Socrates preferred to captivate the interest of the interlocutor with questions, in order to discover one's own knowledge; knowledge that is already within ourselves. Undoubtedly, Socrates made use of so-called empirical knowledge acquisition through experience, observation and deduction (constructivist learning), which is attributed to Vygotsky and Piaget, two and a half millennia earlier. This method of Socrates is known as obstetrics. As, for example, the "μαία" (the midwife) removes the child from the womb of a mother, and so Socrates helped his interlocutor to externalize the knowledge that he already had inside of him, without of course being aware or conscious. It could be argued, that Socrates represents the current ordinary citizen, a man who can be described by natural wisdom and genuine interest to learn and understand the problems surrounding him.

Socrates lived in the 5th century BC known as the Golden Age of Pericles. Pericles was a great supporter of freedom of speech and people's participation in politics. He is considered the founder of democracy and western civilization. In the years of Pericles the market acquired particular importance. It is remarkable that

Pericles supported the popular masses and helped them to gain more rights limiting the power of the aristocratic class to which he himself belonged. The Athenian system of governance was direct democracy rather than representative as it is implemented today. It consisted of three political bodies where citizens gathered in numbers running into the hundreds or thousands. The members of the Assembly (Gr: ἐκκλησία), unlike in a contemporary parliament were not elected, but attended by right when they chose. They could be as many as 6,000. The Assembly had several functions. For example, it could take executive decisions like for example to go to war or to grant citizenship to a foreigner. It also legislated and it tried political crimes. The other function of the Assembly was to elect around 100 out of the over 1000 officials who were the actual administrative force of Athens. The remaining officers were chosen either by lottery. While citizens voting in the Assembly were free of review or punishment, those same citizens when holding office they could be punished very severely. Officeholders were seen as agents of the people, not as their representatives.

Any Athenian citizen could submit proposals to the Council. During the 5th century, there were 10 regular meetings of the Assembly each year (the next century they were increased to 40). In the in-between time, people were discussing each topic in the Agora. Typically, before the day of the meeting and voting, the people came to an agreement through discussion and wide consultation. Through

broad participation of the masses, ancient Athenians were able to cultivate a sense of co-ownership of both problems and decisions.

Unfortunately there is no similar model practiced today. Some scientists use the term "Public Sphere" to define the necessary elements of a system that would ensure a participatory democracy:

- Freedoms that are guaranteed by the constitution such as freedom of speech or human rights in general;
- The existence of a pluralistic system and independent media, which are not under state control;
- Free access to information;
- A vibrant civil society that can control the responsibility of those who manage public affairs;
- The existence of places where they can gather and talk to ordinary citizens. Such areas may include coffee shops, workplaces, or even schools.

As we concluded in the previous chapters, by themselves these guidelines cannot provide authentic, truthful and effective participation of a large number of citizens in negotiating a complex modern problem. It is for this reason that for several decades, scientists from around the world are struggling to further develop and consolidate the science of structured democratic dialogue, which gives stakeholders the opportunity to participate effectively and not typically in a consultation.

For several years now, the European Commission and other international organizations, encourage the use of methods that promote inclusive and democratic dialogue as a means of solving problems and reaching agreements that are acceptable to all involved. The aim of this manuscript is not to present methodologies or suggests that the authentic participation of many people in a dialogue is a simplistic case. For the citizen it is important to know that structured methodologies exist to allow us to conduct democratic dialogues, which ensure a high degree of democratic participation of many stakeholders. They also allow a common understanding on a topic of concern to a team and assist participants to reach mutually acceptable and agreed courses of action. Such methodologies are based on the premise that those who are affected by a particular problem, they collectively possess the knowledge required for its analysis, understanding and resolution. Through a structured process of dialogue, the sense of co-ownership of the problem is cultivated. Also, gradually a shared understanding is achieved of the various aspects and a common language develops. The most important thing is that participants feel co-owners of the solution and the changes agreed. This ensures smooth implementation of an agreed plan of action.

We conclude that the state must ensure that reforms of any systems that manage people's lives would be always conducted in manners acceptable to those whose lives are affected.

The 9th commandment requires that the state be obliged to promote reforms only through democratically structured dialogue. The dialogue should include representatives of all parties involved as well as ordinary citizens.

10th Commandment: Reforms made based on an agreed road map

It's no secret that politicians of a country often fully agree on the need for a particular change. Most times even opposing factions have exactly the same view with respect to proposed changes and adjustments that must be made in order to improve the system. The overlap of their views can sometimes be up to such an extent that even hinders the development of rhetoric in public in a manner understandable to fans. More often than not, they are forced to barricade themselves behind the position that "they do not trust their opponents" and they claim authority because they declare, "they will implement the *same* reforms but *better*." This causes the citizen to lose confidence in politicians and gradually to distance himself. The situation may be even more tragic. Behind the scenes of publicity, it is likely for politicians to be entertained with their so-called opponents and mutually mock each other for their arguments. The question that interests us is whether it is possible for one to be liberated from such a situation of political deadlock.

The answer is not only a "yes." As weird as that sounds, the impasse can be overcome relatively easily with some changes in the *administration* of the impasse.

First, let us elaborate on the positive perspective. We hypothesized above that opposing political forces may agree on a specific political / legal / economic reform as well as to the specific arrangements required in order to implement the change. In recent decades we have seen this phenomenon occur in almost all democracies of the Western world. The political cost, however, for both the ruling party and the opposition is such that for the alpha or beta reason does not allow them to agree to consent publicly. The reason is that the possible negative consequences of such a decision for their party group may be direct and very negative. This political cost could however be reduced or even minimized if the *time of reaching an agreement is disconnected from the time of its application*. If all sides publicly position themselves that reforms negotiated will be implemented at an agreed *later* time frame (e.g. in 10 years) the environment will automatically be discharged from the stress of the immediate political cost. In such a context it is possible for a more creative and constructive discussion to be held and to reach agreement more widely accepted by many political parties.

If such an agreement in substance is reached, that describes the specific reforms required in the interest of all,

then the process can leap forward to achieve the second part of the agreement, namely the drafting of a roadmap for implementation. After the agreement of the political forces on all the reforms and the landmark of their final adoption and implementation, one can even designate the development of the roadmap to technical committees.

The approach proposed here is different from the usual practice, which focuses on micro-changes that begin immediately, while meaningful and necessary reforms are shifted to a time when one can benefit from a greater consensus or when events will dictate them. Unfortunately, the current approach is based on consensus achieved only for short-term and painless goals.

The proposed 10th Commandment facilitates the process because it helps the attainment of a comprehensive and meaningful agreement on the substance of the problem and then requires the preparation of the implementation roadmap that will initiate the process step by step towards an agreed future with agreed milestones. The processing of the roadmap starts with the final milestones in the future and is constructed and agreed backwards, namely from the future to the present.

Beyond the Commandments: Continuous measures for the evolution of democracy

As mentioned in the introduction of this manuscript, the "10 Commandments" are not a comprehensive reform proposal, nor is it product of strenuous research. However they reflect concerns, thoughts, desires and demands of many citizens who envision the transformation of the current system of governance in a new democracy characterized by transparency and participation.

In several chapters of the 10 Commandments we saw how, within the current model of representative democracy, politicians are "obliged" to make "concessions" which result in failing to see through their pre-election commitments. The system is such that favors the lack of transparency, while also maintaining and cultivating interweaving and corruption. The reason why politicians do not deal morally and ethically the public issues, is not necessarily because they do not have the required skills nor it is because they do not want to. The real cause lays in the lack of education, standards, transparency, institutions, mechanisms and political culture. The politicians do not feel compelled to behave differently because the system

deprives citizens the chance of direct participation, evaluation and intervention.

In recent decades more emphasis is placed on the technical implementation of "democracy" rather than the substance for which the people demand democracy. The thousands of patriots and visionaries who sacrificed their lives for a better world, they did not do it in the name of democracy but in the name of freedom. The famous slogan of the French Revolution, *Liberté, égalité, fraternité* (in Greek: Liberty, Equality, Brotherhood) is definitely not aimed at ensuring a simple right to vote that one exercises every 4-5 years! To the contrary, the fighters of the revolution gave their lives to secure freedom, equality and solidarity between people. The current model of representative democracy can, no longer ensure these principles, and especially the authentic and genuine freedom of the individual.

The term "participatory democracy", which is recently used to describe a type of liberal democracy, emphasizes the broad involvement of citizens in managing issues that concern them. Such an approach is in contrast to traditional representative democracies, which in fact restrict the participation of citizens in the election of representatives who then decide on all issues. While the current regimes essentially outsource governance to a professional oligarchy, participatory democracy introduces evidence of

"direct democracy" which expands the number of people involved in political processes and decision-making.

It is useful to look at the rudimentary form of participatory democracy practiced in Switzerland through the institution of regular referendums. For example, during a weekend, decisions are taken using the referendum for more than ten different themes. The constitution defines the kind of laws that require referenda. All others can be canceled if within three months of the vote 50 000 signatures are collected. The Swiss model could be expanded through the use of electronic voting. Theoretically, the citizen could be involved even in daily consultation and decisions on all issues facing the state. In an era in which people acquire higher education and use of technology, the Internet allows not only direct and interactive communication. Thus legislators could take even more advantage of such technological capabilities.

Although the concepts of both access to information and direct and participatory democracy are viewed as ideal solutions to today's problems, the truth is that not only they cannot be easily applied, but also there are also theoretical risks lurking.

As we concluded in previous chapters, for one to be able to participate actively, effectively and wisely in governance is not enough to ensure certain procedures. One has to have cognitive mastery over the subject on which s/he

is asked to express an opinion or decide on. The term cognitive mastery suggests that merely providing information and access to information alone is not enough to form a responsible opinion and a wise choice. To the contrary, one needs to have deep critical understanding and expertise (not just information) to be able to express preferences. And the necessary knowledge is not available through participation and the power to take decisions, but it is a prerequisite thereof. Also, the ordinary citizen, as opposed to the elected, is not accountable to anyone if s/he makes a wrong choice. Therefore, there is no element of checks and balances. Moreover, not everybody can have an equal decision power over everything because some are more influenced by a certain decision than others. This is why in previous sections we elaborated on the need for participation of the stakeholders of every situation, i.e., those whose lives will be influenced by any decisions taken.

We conclude that the current phenomenon of obsolescence of citizens and particularly the educated youth towards politics and the complete lack of trust in politicians cannot be remedied with a simple call to citizens to participate in public affairs. Truly a foul challenge is the view that a citizen is exercising his ultimate democratic right through his participation in elections, which are held every 4-5 years and result in the selection of representatives. Similarly, the democratic deficit cannot be overcome by ensuring the right of citizens to participate in decision

making through numerous referendums, even with simple use of the Internet as a means of voting or filing of views.

What we need in today's society goes far beyond the establishment of principles and institutions that would ensure transparency and the elimination of uncontrolled and arbitrary policy. This leads mathematically to the arrogance of the ruling elite, and eventually feeds the indifference, apathy and pessimism of the governed. What is required by the complexity of the problems we face is the institutionalization of measures and institutions, which will ensure an authentic and meaningful citizenship. This is possible only by introducing new practices and methodologies such as structured democratic dialogue grounded on the new science of structured dialogic design that allows the use of collective wisdom and social intelligence. Briefly, citizens expect that those who volunteer to work in the community will legislate in a way that will facilitate the gradual evolution of the current system of governance.

From "Commandments" to action

The ideas in this short book do not in any way call for the formation of a new socio-political system. They cannot be straightforwardly translated into a roadmap for reform of the present system. They do not even include any recipes or contours, or even precise descriptions of an ideal new constitution.

The ideas elaborated here can however contribute to fostering a climate of optimism and creative exchange of views something that we need today more than ever before. Only then can we achieve the peaceful transformation of the current model of democratic governance into a new system that will respond to the complexity of the problems our societies are facing and which will be capable of harnessing the gifts of emerging sciences and technologies as well as collective intelligence and collective wisdom.

This short manuscript has also intended to shade some light to new challenges emerging in the horizon and which alert for the urgency of transforming the current model of democratic governance. Only through open and authentic discussion and deliberation that will involve all layers of

society we might succeed in identifying what is it that we wanted, and to crystallize our collective views and visions for an ideal future.

The transition between awareness of the problem, the realization of required reforms and the envisioning and implementation of a new model of governance requires serious and coordinated action. Regardless of one's individual political and philosophical beliefs, everyone will need to work together as a huge social mass that requires all of its parties to adopt both verbally and practically popular "Commandments." These will of course be determined and will evolve through open debates. Any party or fraction, which does not adopt the Commandments of citizens, definitely does not deserve our vote. If this is not met by any of the existing parties, it is preferable for the active citizen to offer in abstinence or "white" vote until either the parties are forced to implement the "commandments" of their citizens or until a new political formation is established that will actually offer to serve its country and its citizens, taking into account their own desires and proposing measures that will ensure an active and meaningful participation.

No other solution exists.

It is in vain and unwise to await the appearance of a savior or a wise man, or to expect that our politicians, in the context of current socio-politico-economical conditions will

save our world. All they can do, unfortunately, is to continue to serve the status quo.

About the author



Yiannis Laouris has studied medicine in former Eastern Germany and was trained as a neurophysiologist and as a systems engineer in West Germany and the United States. He is currently president of the Research, Non-profit Organization Future Worlds Center (FutureWorldsCenter.org) and Board member of the Institute for 21st Century Agoras (globalagoras.org). Born in Paphos, son of teacher Christodoulos Laouris. He is married to psychiatrist Joulietta Kalli-Laouri and has a daughter, Romina.

In the early 90's, along with partners, he founded the chain of computer learning centers known as CYBER KIDS, which aimed to stimulate, develop and cultivate creative thinking and problem solving skills through the integration of IT in education. Being a social entrepreneur, he has been working intensely on issues of peace and positive social change. He has applied widely structured democratic dialogue as a systemic methodology for solving problems and achieving social reforms.

Yiannis Laouris

His team has undertaken over 30 international and/or European projects on human rights, social justice, accountability and systemic reforms. Their work has been recognized with various awards including the 1998 Award for Innovation and Creativity of the Employers and Industrialists Federation (for the innovative curriculum of CYBER KIDS), the 2008 Distinguished Scientists Prize of the Hellenic Society for Systemic Studies (for the development and application of the science of systems dialogic design), the 2008 First Prize for Social Cohesion of the Cyprus civil society awards, and more recently the 2011 Euro-Mediterranean Award for Dialogue between Cultures (Honorable Mention-second place) of the Anna Lindh Foundation (for promoting peace and Millennium Development Goals in the Euro-Mediterranean region).

Yiannis Laouris is author of several social science books including 'Masks of Demons,' which addresses the concept of stereotypes in the context of the Cyprus conflict. He has published more than 50 scientific papers and 20 chapters in peer reviewed journals and books. He has presented papers in more than 150 conferences on neuroscience, education, technology, dialogue and peace.

Citizens expect their legislators to modernize and upgrade the way in which they perform their work and to meet the requirements of current international developments.

The "10 Commandments" echo reflections, thoughts, desires and demands of many citizens who envision a gradual evolution of the representative democracy model to a model that is inspired by authentic immediacy and inclusiveness in all aspects of governance and management: A model that, will allow the full harnessing of both collective wisdom and collective intelligence.

10 Commandments
Citizens to State
YiannisLaouris

Copyright © 2012, 2013 Yiannis Laouris

Cyprus 2013
All rights reserved

ISBN-13: 978-9963-9992-1-7