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The surrounding world is changing. Uncertainty is the only certain thing projected. The Western Civilization is moving from the 20th century orderly and stable Modernity to the chaotic and unstable reality of the 21st century. Technology is galloping fast and high, society moves from poverty to prosperity, from scarcity to affluent and democracy celebrates it becoming the dominant form of government. However, while everything around is shaking, democracy, in principle, remained stable and unchanged, similar to its theoretical model. Many youngsters dislike such an old-fashioned system. It is pronounced by decreasing participation in general election, by increasing the importance and effects of the social networks and by the growing number of varieties of minority groups. The author suggests several amendments and for updating democracy and make it suitable for the Digital Era’s requirements. Among the proposed adjustments are: Introducing and legitimizing Referendums, expanding E-government activities and creating a government based on a Grand-Coalition, composed of the two largest parties, instead of the coalition-opposition traditional set up. For by-passing bureaucracy, a permanent channel of exceptional committees should be established. Bureaucracy must be revitalized to be more human-oriented and customer-friendly. The article ends with proposing a practical course for implementation.
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\textbf{Introduction}

The event that caused us to write this essay is first and foremost the present discussion on the Brexit. Thoughts on the motives and the consequences of this act should be given to this issue by both English and European scholars. Here we just intend examining some reflections and impacts, such an event has on the meaning and structures of democracy, in the 21st century. We have already claimed\textsuperscript{2} that we see the move from the 20th to the 21st century as a conceptual move from the orderly Modernity of 20th century, to the chaotic and uncertain Post-modern Era of 21st century. Such a move, a change or a shift may remain unobserved by lay persons or even scholars of Science or Life study. However, for those who deals with people, communities and societies the move means much. It describes and explains the differences in human thinking, feeling and behaving throughout the past decades. Since we are still experiencing this move, it is not easy and sometimes even impossible to understand and explain why and how some basic changes are taking place and what were the causes and the triggers for a given event. The Brexit is a very good example for demonstrating

\textsuperscript{1}As defined by Samuel Huntington (1996) in his book, \textit{The Clash of Civilizations}.

\textsuperscript{2}A. Avny (2019).
how little we know about its origins and goals. We doubt also, whether the Britons themselves can provide a satisfying answer. In any case, this work focuses mainly on one aspect of the issue. We wish to see what can be learnt from this dramatic act. And how could it affect our main concerning of improving and encouraging the viability of the Western Liberal Democracy today.

**Reasons Justifying the Paradigmatic Move**

The move from the 20th to the 21st century could be perceived as a conceptual or a paradigmatic move, from the orderly Modernity to the chaotic Post-modern Era. Although not too many agree, but this is an important cognitive change and a passage from the “tyranny” of the “or” to the “ingenuity” of the “having them all”, as termed by J. Collins\(^3\). Others might call such a move

The Poor have no choice; they have to choose between alternatives. The Rich, however, can use all alternatives by utilizing all options. (A. Avny, 2019)

The poor are forced choosing between oranges and apples, while the rich can afford having both of them. Such a conceptual move, which is a significant cognitive change symbolizes the difference between the two eras. In fact, it is, a revised approach to life, which takes place in a dramatic form, that frequently remains less-comprehended. The “need to choose” or the “Scarcity” axiom, which lay at the basis of the capitalist economic thinking, are the main motivating elements that had fueled economic thinking for years. However, the contemporary reality of “Affluence” changes the rules of the game and forces building a new economic and social paradigm.

Understandably, the political-economic paradigmatic change at the West, also affects the meaning of the liberal democracy. In spite of some conceptual principles and basic ground rules, Democracy of the affluent Western societies, differs from these of the poor countries. Some might oppose this differentiation, some will stick to the old obsolete maxim that “all people and societies are equal”, but we see that opposition as an irrelevant and an out of contexed expressions The debate here is about the results and the outcomes of human activity, rather than the wishful or inspiring opening conditions. Like in a field race, all runners start at the same time, but end in accordance with their compatibility. For better understanding the debate on the different between the affluent Western democracies and the other less-developed ones we have to go back some fifty years. At the aftermath of World War Two, a new generation was born in the West, which was raised throughout a long period of scarcity of products and services. Mothers had forced us, all along our childhood, to eat tasteless foods, because there are many hungry kids in Africa. And now, at the 21st century, we became affluent, which enable us to depart from past habits while forcing us to adopt a different mind-set. Today we buy what we wish rather than what we need. We eat more with our eyes than with our mouth. More people in the West, today, die from obesity and diabetes than from hunger.

At the same time, in Less-Developed Countries (LDCs) many still suffer from shortages in many areas. So, inequality still exists and has a significant impact on the behavior of those nations.

Changing the Westerners’ mind-set is not easy, but is necessary. It forces revising our social paradigm and our approach to human behavior. We, the Westerners, are obliged to adopt a new real vision of contemporary time. A vision that affects all walks of life, including Democracy, as the Western form of government.

---

\(^3\) J. Collins (1990), Chapter 2, p. 48.
The Changing World

We have already mentioned (in the previous section), that the world is changing. Similarly, to other transitions, one knows where he or she is coming from, but rarely they know where are they going to. In such a significant change as the conceptual or paradigmatic one, the vision of the future is even more unclear and vague. Ordinary human beings and normal business people tend preferring stable surrounding and steady administrative and well-organized environment. However, as said, nobody today can promise such a tranquility. It is really, a complicated world that almost nobody can do anything about it. So, when we cannot change the world, we have to change ourselves, in order not only to survive, but even to benefit from the new conditions. Referring to our topic—democracy, let us first examine some of the surrounding processes and their impact on the democratic system.

The Galloping Technology

The term “galloping” is used here for reminding us on the man-machine complexity that accompanied humanity from its early days. Throughout history, all kinds of horses were harnessed for serving their human masters. Horses were used for long distant military marches, for land cultivation and for entertainments and pleasure. But always was it the couple, the horse and its rider, the hussar or the jockey that act together. The same thing is with man-machine interrelation. It makes no sense philosophizing who come first? Or who is more important? Because at the end, mission could be accomplished only by cooperation of these two elements. As much as such a synergy or partnership, is real, deeper and more trustworthy, so will it perform better and achieve more accomplishments. The main advantage of Synergy, Partnership, Team work, Cooperation and Collaboration is the ability of combining the capability, talent and competence of every partner and converging it into a powerful mission force that may overcome any resistance. A combination of a man and a horse, or a man and a machine can do and achieve much more accomplishments. So, Galloping Technology claims that human beings combining with technology, eventually, might achieve almost everything. The concealed conclusion referred here, hints on the Author’s tendency of treating and solving major undertakings.

Some say that the last fifty years of technological advancement surpasses most of previous development that started at the early days of humanity. It is nice thinking like that, but who can evaluate what and how the invention of fire had affected and drove processes of developing other matters. In any case, technology is galloping, and galloping fast, and so changes and even threats many aspects of our Post-modern life. Harari (2018) worries much about it when he writes:

Big data algorithms might create digital dictatorships in which all power is concentrated in the hands of a tiny elite while most people suffer not from exploitation, but from something far worse—irrelevancy. (Introduction)

Just for example, think about the mobile phone and its numerous derivations. Today, we now very much on very many bizarre occurrences, all over the globe, in real time and in colored visual media. Theoretically, one cannot get lost in unknown territory. Medicine proceeds so fast that the prognosis of personal diagnosis and treatment is going to become reality within the coming decades. In short, Info-Tec and Bio-Tec, are going to dominate our life while we have just to adjust ourselves and be ready to take most benefits out of it. Within these shaking conditions and chaotic environment stands and functions the traditional democratic establishment as a Bastion of “Liberty, Equality and Fraternity.” Throughout the years some insignificant changes and adjustments had been assimilated in the democratic system, but basically it remains as the original form,
contemplated by the Founding Fathers in the different countries.

Largely, technology might be divided into two aspects: Hardware and Software. The Hardware contains the instruments, gadgets and techniques that are invented and created by human beings. Software, however, contains the effects and impacts the hardware have on human beings. Whereas future development of hardware could somewhere be foreseen and assessed, it is very difficult and almost impossible to evaluate the effects of software. The effects of the mobile phone revolution are very helpful in demonstrating the change. The mobile phone tremendous expansion has promoted interpersonal communication and availed much immediate information. On the other side, however, it made many users to be totally dependent on this instrument.

In many countries and by people of all ages, one can find cellphone addicts who care about their cellphone more than anyone in their family. Such an addiction or dependence is bad and sometimes even dangerous. Ironically, it could be said, that the smartphone revolution caused many to think less and talk much, instead of more thinking and less talking. In addition, the anonymity used in most social Media just encourages such a less-responsible behavior, hidden under the “free of speech” slogan.

Another, yet much more dangerous, use of the social media, lays in the role the media plays in facilitating international networks of violence and terror. A reliable opinion about the threats and the potential dangers envisioned from this combination is expressed by Shabtai Shavit (2018), a former head of Israel secret service, in his book Head of Mossad:

> The global communication contributes to the empowerment of the radical Islamic threatening potential…The global Islamic terror organizations, get a free platform for broadcasting their propaganda and their threatening messages. In this way they increase fear and horror to the uncertainty, already exists, in the shaky world. (Shavit, Chap. 2, p. 85)

And so, as in many other cases, there is no good without something bad. The technological advancement brought, and will continue to yield, many wonderful achievements to humanity. However, always some mean and nasty people will try using this platform for promoting their malicious goals.

**The Cost of Liberal Freedom**

Psychological drives and motives frequently appear in addition to threats caused by the technological advancements. At the complicated, dynamic and dramatic life of today, when “nothing is certain but the uncertainty”, many ordinary people may get lost. Others, fewer, may tend to be radicals who support extreme measures as violence and terror. They tend interpreting “Freedom” as a permission to do what they wish and without any control. Frequently such a behavior, which is fueled by psychological motives of hidden unsecured personality, or low self-esteem is un-comprehended by the administration. Unfortunately, many agencies that were designed to take care of these radical or extreme groups, tend to use rational approaches and logical methods for treating people that wish to be irrational and are motivated by deep emotions.

This is a type of an inherent paradox, that is feasible only in a liberal democracy, where individual freedom is so deep installed and secured. The US Supreme Court had decided at least in two occasions that the bureaucracy’s ease is not a satisfying cause for infringing the freedom of the individual. Similarly, the Supreme Court ruled that preserving the personal freedom of homeless people should prevent governments from sending them away off the main streets. They have the Constitutional right, as free citizens, to pick their sleeping site.

These are only two of many examples demonstrating how short are democracy and its agencies in solving or settling complicated and unforeseen problems that appear with progress and prosperity.

**An Inherent Biased Just Is Hidden in Democracy**
The biased appears in most democracies and starts with the ending of all kinds of general election. The two-party or coalition-opposition model of election contains a built-in element of unfairness or preference. The winners, win it all while the losers, lose it all. It runs like a Zero-Sum game. Thus, a government could be established by 51 percent, in some cases even less, of the voters. Such a model was acceptable in times when serious ideologies were differentiating the electorate. The Conservative vis a vis the Labor, in UK, the Right vis a vis the Left in France, the Democrats vis a vis the Republicans in US. Even so, the American Founding Fathers were aware to the danger of concentrating power in one party, and tried to divide or balance the government between the President, the Senate and the House of Representatives. It is therefore, understandable that more and more fractions in society are unsatisfied from such an old unfair arrangement and call to change the mode of establishing government.

The Demise of the Traditional Ideologies

Following the “Industrial Revolution”, in the 19th century, two main ideologies, Socialism and Capitalism, had emerged and dominated the political-economic agenda, firstly in the West and later in the whole world. Capitalism, in essence, took care of the capital owners’ interests. While Socialism, intended to take care of the Laborers’ interests. The ideological discourse has developed into a severe political conflict that eventually resulted with the Cold War. During more than hundred years of conflict, both sides had adopted and used ideas, techniques and practices taken from their opponents. Consequently, very little original difference remained relevant in the end of the 20th century. US of America, the grand gospel of Capitalism had introduced and enacted the Social Security Service, which represents one of the Socialism’s main demand—the nation’s responsibility for its citizens’ welfare.

On the other side, every Socialist regime recognizes the capital’s crucial role in the economy

Many other capitalist slogans, like “Free Market”, “Keeping government out of the economy” and “Free international trade” remained less than slogans, because no politician keeps them alive. The first and foremost person who leads this disregarding move is President Donald Trump.

The affiliation with a political party, also loses it ideological reasoning. At present it is basically a matter of sympathy, family or social environment and even personal legacy.

So, as previously assumed, when 80 percent of the constituent agree upon 80 percent of the issues, there is no good reason or enough support for opposing collaboration and cooperation between the two leading political powers. Such a collaboration might be used for creating a national leadership and government. It seems that this type of building a government might get the support of the majority of the young voters.

Germany, with a good and well-functioning government for 40 years, provides a good and a convincing example of this idea. Radicals and extreme activists, however, will always find an issue for enabling them to loudly disagree and fiercely demonstrate their opposition.

The Election’s Primitive Form Should Be Replaced

The running general election system is a disgrace. Winston Churchill had described it picturesquely some fifty years back as:

At the bottom of all the tributes paid to democracy is the little man, walking into the little booth, with a little pencil, making a little cross on a little bit of paper—no amount of rhetoric or voluminous discussion can possibly diminish the overwhelming importance of that point. (House of Commons, 31 October 1944)

The current technological advancement enables to setup a much more sophisticated system, which will
function safer, faster and with less mistakes. The Identification issue could be resolved by either, using the cellphone with an election personal code, or using a Smart Card through a dedicated election machine. In any case, this is just a technological problem that somebody should properly solve it.

**Acts to Be Taken for Updating Democracy**

**Improving Democracies Slowness in Reacting**

Basically, we support the idea of conservative legalistic, judiciary and low-obedience systems. In the chaotic, restless, uncertain and confused world, some serious and matured people and organizations are very required. Job, of the Bible had recognized this necessity when he claimed: “With the ancient is wisdom, and in length of days understanding” (Job, 12, 12).

Whereas all agree that the Supreme Court must remain the ultimate “Bastion of Justice”, some claim that changes should be introduced also to its relations with the other branches of government. The changing world demands that the ruling establishments will hasten their moves toward proper addressing the fluctuating real world. Traditional concepts are changed, conventional approaches get new meaning, societies are struggling with new monumental issues, and all these changes must be a companied by a dynamic and creative system of law and governance. The previous pace, demonstrated by the white wig of English Judges, hinting on the “wisdom of the elders” must be enhanced and fastening in order to meet the upcoming demands.

Bureaucracy, that two hundred years back was a symbol of progress and justice, in the 21st century became frequently a hurdle and an obstacle. Unfortunately, bureaucracy frequently, is less people-oriented and more establishment-oriented system. Simple problems, resolved fast and easily by the private sector, take tones of time for being positively settled by the public sector.

These practices must sooner be changed.

In order to make the Parliament more attuned to the people’s demands, it is suggested to revise the way its members are elected. It is suggested that half of the members will be elected every half of the term. For example, in a house of 200 members with a term of four years, 100 members will be elected every two years. In this way, innovation will be introduced every two years, while experience and continuity will be maintained by assuring the replacing of only half of the members. As this method is successfully maintained in US House of representatives, there is no good reason why it cannot be applied in other parliaments.

**Changing the Parliament Authentic Profile**

The best and just way for doing this change is by introducing the relative general election practice with minimal entering percentage. Using such a model for electing representatives ensures a true reflection of the constituent and significantly increases the House level of representation. It will enable better representation of minority groups, by replacing the Zero-Sum outcomes with a better system of representation—the proposed Win-Win solution. The existing Zero-Sum practice assumes that the winner wins all the House seats and the loser accepts nothing, zero seats. Although the proposed method achieves a better and a more just expression of the general public’s opinion, it is more complicated for establishing a stable government. Since this is an important issue a worthful attention will be given to it in a separate section. Here also, the supporters and advocates of the Majority mode of election will oppose the proposed change. They will come from different disciplines and will promote contradiction, because of various reasons. But the opponents’ major reasons for maintaining such a contradiction are, worries about the novel unknown situation, fears of losing power and
control, and a traditional conservative attitude. These hardships should be taken into account in the implementation phase.

**Introducing and Legitimizing Public Referendums**

One of the outcomes emerged from the communication tremendous advancement is the growing ability of the general public to communicate with themselves as well as with others. This capability also increases people’s wish to communicate with their representatives and to better steer their delegates. In short, the constituent, and youngsters in particular, demand shorter lines of communication and much more speedy time of responding.

All together many are not happy with the Representative Democracy Model. In order to meet these sincere requirements, while preserving the Representative Model, it is suggested to promote the idea of frequenting the use of Public Referendums.

It is true that this form of public involvement is not very popular, (we know only two nations, Switzerland and US, that already use this technique), but everything should be started sometime. Relevant principles, application rules and all the necessary arrangements should be discussed and examined, but finally, Public Referendums must be legitimized and becoming an undeniable part of the whole structure of the liberal Democracy.

Some important groups might oppose such a move. Among them might be Senators and Parliament members—being afraid of losing some of their power and control, Academicians and scholars—being afraid of losing their prestige and Judges—being anxious of being overruled. These contradictions must be taken into account and well settled when the new technique will be introduced.

**New Method for Setting up a Stable Government**

After revising the election mode, adopting a better model for representing the constituent attitudes and improving the reflection of public opinion by using referendums, time comes for bettering the establishing of a stable government. The traditional coalition-opposition model, used in many of the Western countries does not function well in many cases. Italy and Spain today, and France some thirty years ago, are good examples of how the former ideological distinction failed to establish a steady government. The Coalition-opposition pattern was relevant when substantial ideological differences had distinguished between the political parties. Today it is just less-effective remnant. As a result, government was usually formed by building a coalition with one leading party and some small fractions. These minority partners used their key position for forcing the larger partner to donate them extra privileges and benefits. This is another example of a Biased Just inherently hidden in Democracies. This biased concept appears when minority groups that circumvent the results of the electorate get too much power within the coalition bounded government. Another drawback of that type of forming a government, is it instability and crises that occurred frequently and hinder government work. The critical and over dependency on minority or radical groups hurts government's stability and its reliable services providing ability.

Since today only few ideological differences still exist, there is no serious justification for continuing this traditional set up. It makes sense assuming that about 80 percent of the constituent agree upon 80 percent of the issues. Thus, why to continue with a pattern that promotes deviation and encourages separation? It is better to turn to a more advanced form of setting up a stable government. We already pointed out that the ideological distinction is no more relevant. We have offered improvements in the general election form, for ensuring better
representation. Additionally, we had suggested to legitimate the use of referendums for solving principle significant discourses. So, for the daily and current stable governance routine, the best solution would be the Grand Coalition. The Grand Coalition means creating a government that rests on the two largest political parties in the Parliament. Such an act will totally reduce the ability of small extreme fractions from abusing the system. Similarly, it will enable maintaining a stable and long-term life for government, fairly represents the wish of the majority. The biased just of less-representative government, will so be replaced by a Win-Win model that is fairer and functions better.

**Overcoming Bureaucracy Stiffness**

When Max Webber (1864-1920) had published his work on Bureaucracy, some hundred fifty of years back, it was a manifest of rational and advanced public service. Bureaucracy, then, symbolized progress and just because it opened the civil service for the general public rather than leaving it in the hands of the aristocracy. No question that, Bureaucracy, Administration, written Rules and Regulations and some kind of Hierarchical structures are necessary and even inevitable for every orderly human group. It also was one of the main advices, given by Jethro to his son-in-law, Moses, when taking the Israelis out of their exile in Egypt: Jethro, the older stateman, understood that every leader must be assisted by some kind of administration for properly run his people:

> So Moses hearkened to the voice of his father-in-law, and did all that he had said…And Moses chose able men out of all Israel, and made them heads over the people, rulers of thousands, rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties and rulers of tens. (Exodos, 18, 24-25)

It is nice noticing that beside smartly utilizing Jethro’s wise and helpful comment, Moses was ready to listen and accepting his father-in-law advice. Not too many young autocratic leaders will be willing even to listen to their fathers-in-law. This is a small gesture that again teaches how great leader Moses was.

Well, bureaucracy is a heavy but an unavoidable burden. However, the relevant question to be asked is, for whom it works?

Originally it was supposed “to work for the people”, as wished the Founding Fathers, but in reality, it works for the masters and the organizations directors. It should be mentioned again that, advancement, innovation and progress are achieved mainly by proceeding on the edge, by embracing unconventional techniques, by opening new horizons, and by encouraging creative thinking. Bureaucracy has little to do with these requirements. Frequently it opposes these initiatives because they are not always done “by the book”.

Thus, we have no choice but to find some measures for minimizing the bureaucracy ability to direct or supervise life. Further, new avenues are offered for minimizing red tapes and decreasing the bureaucracy power and its negative involvement in daily life. The proposed three courses of action are:

1. Maximizing and Expanding E-government Activities.
   The major improvement of government activity should be achieved by increasing the share of digital functioning—the E-government activity. As more areas and functions will be converted into areas led by electronic and computer techniques, so will decrease the dependency on human bureaucrats, while government efficiency will go up. Robots and computers can replace many routine procedures while doing it faster easier and more precisely.

2. Establishing Exceptional Committees
This is a new initiative of opening a designated channel for treating exceptional cases. Setting up special bodies designated for treating exceptional cases is a kind of an improvement and an additional tool proposed for hastening bureaucracy performance. Formal treatment, routine procedure and conventional “by-the-book” functionality are among the typical modes of operation that characterize large organizations and governments. They cannot totally be deleted. Introducing a line of Exceptional Committees into most governmental agencies and forcing orderly use of them, may assist in circumventing bureaucracy stopping, increasing citizen’s satisfaction and help in upgrading democracy. These committees should be staffed by nominees from the specific agency, private lawyers and representatives of the general public. Consequently, they must become an inherent and indispensable part of every large ministry, department or agency.

(3) Improving Service Given to Less-privileged, Elders and Poor

At the 21st century, almost all agree that governments shall “promote the general welfare, and secure the blessing of liberty”.

However, the capitalist legacy of permanent competition helped many to forget this constitutional command. Moreover, many, individuals, public agencies and private organizations disregard a well-known rule of management that says: “The strength of a chain is determined by its weakest component”.

Hence, nations’ strength and potential, and their citizens’ quality of life, are determined by the level and quality of their social services.

With due respect to the promise of e-government and the hopes it evokes about bettering government work, always will remain citizens that will fail to take advantage of such an advancement. Some of them will be elders and others will be less-privileged because of many reasons. In these cases, the administration should make efforts for providing additional designated services for meeting the specific requirements. Such an activity is not only a civic must, but also a gesture of humanity and a symbol of culture. In short, the bureaucracy and the administration must learn to be more human-oriented and more people-friendly. This is a behavior that junior sale-persons learn in their early days while public servants must adopt from their first days. Developing such a behavior should characterize officials of the Western Liberal Democracy.

Implementation

The taste of the pudding is determined by the eater. (An English proverb)
Patience leads to happiness, impatience results with frustration, those who seek happiness must be patient.
(Anonymous)

Hurdles in the Course of Implementation

The relevancy of most good ideas is determined by their implementation. As a rule of thumb, it can be said that proper execution of 80% of the proposed ideas, may be seen as a good implementation. Moreover, in most cases, evolutionary change achieves better results than a revolution. Further, the change size and meaning determines the length of the implementation period.

Finally, as much as the transition is more meaningful and more significant, so much appears more opponents, adversaries and antagonists. Large traditional organizations contain bodies with many vested interests. It is, therefore, quite difficult convincing them on the necessity and the justification for introducing a significant change. Most conventional organization, very large in particular, prefer to continue the existing

---

4 The Preamble to the American Constitution.
Status Quo. They think they know what they have to know, they are afraid of the unknown or the uncertain.

Implementation is enacted throughout a long and complicated process. It experiences ups and downs as well as forward and backward moves. The key for attaining success is having features like devotion, continuity and consistency by the leading Change Agents. Although these are the preliminary features required for assuring a positive start, they are also crucial for accomplishing and achieving the successful Finale.

The Process of Implementation

The process begins with a general theoretical debate, carried out by Judges, Lowers, Academicians and other political sciences specialists. As Implementation is executed step by step, they can be enacted either consequential or in parallel. Below is presented a theoretical sequence of the implementation process:

Step I. Nomination of a Steering Committee

The committee should contain some prominent figures, from the Judiciary, the Government, the Academia and the Private sector. These individuals must be elected due to their practical knowledge and their ability to introduce and running changes in large organizations. This practical experience is crucial for assuring a successful and effective incorporation of the change in the system.

Step II. Involving the Media and the General Public in the Issue

One of the reasons for updating democracy is the growing dissatisfaction the existing political system, evokes among young people. Although grandparents should not always agree with their grandchildren, in this case it is necessary and required. Nowadays rate and form of expressions are totally different from the former regular and orderly ones. It is, therefore, natural that the political establishment and the Media are interested in attracting youngsters for improving the current system. That positive effect is not only desirable but rather, crucial for ensuring the implementation of the improvements.

Step III. Interesting Government and Parliament in the Proposal

These two institutions should make the decision about the required changes. Since most opponents rest within these establishments’ special attention and an intensive preparation work should be invested there. Part of the opponents have invested interests in the running system, and they are afraid of losing them. Some of the opponents are just conservative by nature, who dislike changes. On the other hand, most of the proposed changes refer to these institutions and to their mode of operation. It is, therefore, fair and essential to involve most of the participating bodies in the process of executing the updating. Among this group there will be some experts and specialists who will assist and hasten the implementation.

Step IV. Discussing the Issue in the Universities

Many Academicians tend to stay on the theoretical level and to minimize their involvement in daily politics. However, since the proposed updating effort has also some theoretical and ideological aspects, it is necessary to get a professional analysis and some scientific grounds. In the spirit of our teaching, of promoting team work and interdisciplinary projects, we hope that groups of Social Sciences scholars and interdisciplinary specialists will be involved and be able to contribute to such an important project.

Step V. Nominating an Executive Committee

A critical phase in every initiative is the decision on who is going to carry it out. A competent leader could save and enhance a less-attractive project, while a less-competent candidate would fail to run even a very promising one. Thus, nominating the executive committee eventually determines the future of a project, its
quality, time-table and cost. When staffing the committee, it is important to find the most competent candidates owing the most appropriate expertise, experienced in interdisciplinary undertaking and able to complete each other. It is also very important to see that the executive committee has the required formal authority and the financial stand for carrying out the project.

Step VI. Presenting a Working Plan for Final Assurance

There is no need spending time on justifying the need for a working plan. Such a plan could manually be prepared either in a simple way, or as a large computer file. In either way it should be clear, readable, understandable and open for critic. However, two points should be remembered: One, the worse plan is better than a non-plan, and Two, even the best plan is a platform for changes.

Step VII. Setting Objectives, Missions and Mile-stones

Although this is the final step of preparation, before the implementation is enacted, it should receive all the attention needed. The project’s staff, after nominating by the executive committee, should invest all the required effort, time and money in preparing the detailed program. The mission and the objective must be clear to all level of management. Mile-stones should be incorporated for two reasons. First, for enabling the executers to run a self-control practices, and secondly, for external control.

Step VIII. Carrying out the Implementation

No more examinations, preparations and excuses. Everything and everyone should be ready and willing to start working.

Conclusions

When the whole world is changing, when the conceptual approach moves from an orderly Modernity to a chaotic Post-modernism approach, time is also ripe for examining the congruence of the current Western Liberal Democracy to the spirit of today. This traditional democracy suffers from old-fashioned type of election, from unjust and unfair representation, from instable government, which frequently depends on irresponsible minorities, and from biased expression of the constituent’s opinion. The presented paper takes into account all the involving interest groups and proposes a set of actions that might repair most of these drawbacks. The article’s main argument is that the advancing technology enables overcoming most of the obstacles, correcting most of the deficiencies and updating Democracy for better fitting the Digital Era requirements. Victor Frankl (1946) wrote about the situation today: “Ever more people today have the means to live, but no meaning to live for”.

We paraphrase this observation by claiming that—today, more people with means still look for inspiring meaning. This updating of democracy mainly intends to meet these desires.

As the Author pays much importance to the implementation issue, and because he also knows that the changes will evoke many opponents, the length of the implementation period is estimated here to last from five to fifteen years.
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