What would it take for you to adovate less centralization? A decetralizer will often be faced with situations such as war, externalities, inequalities, pandemics and will either find a way to explain how these things will be dealt with less decentralization, and if he finds that perhaps his explanation isn't good enough, will give a role for the state.  
  
A centralizer on the other hand seems to always advocate for more centralization, if things are going well, they say that if we decentralize, they would NOT be going well. And if they are not going well, well we must centralize to solve them. Indeed, a centralizer is almost by definition a communist, the only difference is their opinion about the speed of transition.   
  
If you don't think that things should be done on the LOWEST scale possible, you are by definition a communist.

The experts have a similar dilemma, whenever there is a crisis, they advocate for more experts. What they don’t say is how appealing to their rules won’t lead us to a life of serfdom.

The solution is to make society less reliant on experts by making sure the shocks are independent, and manageable at a local level.

The dynamics of serfdom

has its own expert, for climate, meteorologists, for war, we need great generals, for collapsing industry we need economists, for pandemics we need epidemiologists. Of course , while they may think it is a good idea for these people to voice their opinions, the centralizer wants to give these people more power before the next crisis so that the next crisis can be less severe.

Of course it is true that societies guided by experts witness a lower number crisis. It seems unlikely that the COVID virus has affected

Whenever there is a crisis of any sort the usual suspects will demand for more centralization. Each crisis has its own experts, regardless of what the crisis is, climate, war, pandemic, economic etc,. Of course these suspects will always be confident in two things, they can identify the period the period of crisis(it is purely coincidental that this sometimes overlaps with their election campaigns) and they can identify the “right” expert.

The proposed use of these experts can be categorized in two forms. Either these experts will be given permanent power, the most common way is to transform the into a bureaucracy. Or they can be given temporary power, either in an authoritarian manner, which usually means the leader bends to their will, or there is a decentralized ideal of temporary increase in influence such as a market ideal, the salaries of the experts increase relative to the non-experts and hence they control a higher proportion. Let’s explain the temporary case first.

If we take the temporary pathway we preserve our freedoms. We give them a temporary influence during the crisis, and then reduce their influence when the crisis ends. Of course if the knowledge these experts generate is sufficient, then even though the institutional structure is the same in the future, they can handle the next crisis better, perhaps they know better how to make vaccines or they know better how to enforce quarantine faster. Of course, these temporary solutions are really no such thing, if people notice the cost of the temporary solutions are too high, they can individually take precautions, localize their production structure.

The other option initially also sounds attractive. That group will claim ‘why don’t we give experts institutional power that is permanent?’, they follow it with, “if the experts can control things from the beginning, we are less likely to enter into this crisis”; This sounds like it makes sense, but consider what this kind of logic does when it is applies recursively, if every crisis passes permanent institutional power to a group of elites. This will inevitably lead to Plato’s republic, initially the experts will control the airlines, then they will control the cars you can drive, then the transactions you can partake in.

This is not a critique, this is merely a description, I am not particularly attached to democracy but I suspect that many people attached to expert opinion, think that this institutional expert power IS compatible with democracy, I am here simply to point out that this is wrong.

Now in this second scenario, imagine we have numerous crises… if you are really aiming for permanent solutions after each crisis, the solution can ONLY be the rule of the elite. This is of course not to deny that this second option requires less faith than the first one, “How do we know we generated enough knowledge to make the next crisis less important?” Thankfully there is a third strategy, while we have to rely on the experts during this time we can try and ask ourselves, how it is that we can becomes less fragile.

This can only be done by creating local communities.

There is only one answer, act local, stop the internationalism, allow for regional independence. In practice this means that borders need to be established, travel must become slower.

The viruses that become dangerous depend on the structure. If the spread is slow, then a deadly virus can do little.

Almost every other plague we can think of

# Beware the permanent solution

At the dawn of every crisis, a class of people, let’s call them the centralizers, rise up and advocate for expertise. Their narrative goes something like this, “each crisis has its own experts”, regardless of what the crisis is, climate, war, pandemic, economic etc,. Of course the centralizers will always be confident in two things, they can identify the period of crisis(it is purely coincidental that it strongly overlaps with their election campaigns) and they can identify the “right” expert.

The proposed use of these experts to reach solutions can be permanent or temporary, here we focus on the permanent solutions. The most common way to give permanent institutional power to experts is through a bureaucracy, a new ministry, a new department, or a new subsidy; Of course this will be followed with, “if the experts can control things from the beginning, we are less likely to enter into this crisis”, a preventative measure.

This sounds very convincing, those who can manage can also prevent. But consider what this kind of logic does when it is applies recursively through time, if every crisis passes permanent institutional power to a group of elites, what else can this lead to other than a technocracy of the kind described by Plato in the republic? Initially the experts will control the airlines, then they will control the cars you can drive, then the transactions you can partake in, etc etc. I am not here to point to anything wrong with a technocracy, merely pointing out that a technocracy is not a democracy.

The problem isn’t that people support what they support, it is that people pretend to be pro-democracy but advocate for undemocratic measures. There is a sphere controlled by the demos, if we move a part of this sphere out of the reach of the demos, where are we moving it? If it is moved to localities, this may not seem so bad, but the experts are not locals, they are the elite, it is autocratic rule.

# Temporary solution

What does a good temporary solution look like? There are a couple of features we could look into.

On the economic side, it would be a shame if the system makes people work overtime without compensating them. Of course if those who work want to renounce the extra payment, they can contribute excess earnings to whatever cause they choose to, however to institutionally not reward those who are most important at a critical time is a mistake.

Indeed those who are currently working should be gaining in relative purchasing power. It would be absurd if the government bailed out everybody and made sure all salaries could be fully paid even if no work was done. Is it really fair that those who work still work get the same payment as before, and those who don’t get paid anyway? NO, their relative salaries have to go up.

The EASY solution to ensure incentives and stability is to simply give a universal basic income during this time.

Of course there may be communities which are less affected than others. If we can identify communities without any covid deaths, say a village, there is no reason to keep them contained (assuming there has been no travel there).

The most important thing is to keep effects local. If you DO want to give permission make sure the permission is geographically bounded.

We can control the VOLUME of people going out. The ideal permission system would be have an APP that scans national ID’S, if we scan your ID more than twice a day.
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