Understanding Eco-Authoritarianism, and Technocracy

Some flaws of democratic one-party capitalist regimes such as that of the United States are that the process of legislation is slow-moving, prone to plutocratic corruption, and that the government makes decisions based on an uninformed population and business interests. For these reasons some look at more authoritarian regimes such as those in Singapore and China as models for possible solutions to these supposedly fundamental problems.

Authoritarian regimes are often really bad, so it must be shown that the problems with democratic regimes are so fundamental that an alternative is required. It must also be shown that other non-democratic governmental bodies are incapable of solving the issues that eco-authoritarianism claims to solve. These requirements are crucial to the justification of such a form of government, so if they are not met, then I cannot endorse the proposed solution.

The Marxist argument against eco-authoritarianism may be that it is due to our economic structure that we are unable to address the impending climate crisis, and that under socialist or communist economies these problems can be addressed. If a direct democracy by the labor class is the solution, how does it follow expert advice instead of alternative populist solutions that may go against ecological sustainability? If the communist argues for a centrally planned economy, does this necessarily differ from eco-authoritarianism, or does it have any reason to emphasize sustainability over individual luxuries and national success?

The globalist may claim that

Nah this theory sux LOL. I believe that there isn’t sufficient evident that an authoritarian regime will better solve climate change than a liberal democratic government.