Documentation Structure

I. Introduction:

A. Overview of the Infographic Project

Infographic project

B. Topic Selection and Rationale

Technocracy. The purpose of this project is to investigate the influence that technocracy has on the democratic decision-making process in the field of technology.

C. Research Objectives and Questions

"The Influence of Technocracy on Democratic Decision-Making in Technology: An In-depth Analysis"

Research questions:

- 1. How have technocratic principles influenced our society?
- 2. How have technical experts approached urban planning?
- 3. In what instances has a balanced approach that combines technocratic expertise with public participation shown promise in managing these complex issues?
- 4. How do technocratic approaches manage the allocation of benefits and resources to prevent disparities among different societal groups?
- 5. What frameworks or guidelines are in place within technocratic systems to address ethical dilemmas and ensure responsible technological innovation?
- 6. How has technological advancement evolved?
- 7. In the 21st century, which disciplines benefited most from the allocation of research funding?
- 8. What has influenced the direction of technological change?
- 9. How democratic is it truly to make policies regarding the use of technology in today's world?
- 10. How is technological policy formulated in a democratic nation?

- 11. What are the technological focuses of developed countries?
- 12. What are the discrepancies in Top-Down decision-making in technological projects?
- 13. What were the negative impacts of technocratic projects?
- 14. What are the current priorities of Indian Technological policymakers?

D. Scope and Limitations:

Project Scope Statement

Project Title: Study of Technocracy's Influence on Democratic Decision Making

Project Objectives:

The primary objective of this research project is to investigate and analyze the impact of technocracy on democratic decision-making processes. Specifically, the project aims to:

- Examine the historical development and evolution of technocracy.
- Analyze current affairs and trends related to technocracy within democratic countries.
- Investigate instances of technocratic influence on democratic decision-making and provide illustrative examples.

Deliverables:

The project will yield a series of informative and visually engaging infographics that present key findings, data, and insights pertaining to the influence of technocracy on democratic decision-making. These infographics will serve as the primary output of the research.

Inclusions:

The following topics and aspects are included within the project scope:

- **History of Technocracy**: A detailed exploration of the historical origins and progression of technocracy as a concept and practice
- **Current Affairs of Technocracy in Democratic Countries:** An Examination of contemporary issues, policies, and trends related to technocracy within democratic nations
- **Technocratic Influence with Examples**: A focused analysis of instances where technocracy has had aDeterminablee impact on democratic decision-making processes, supported by illustrative examples and case studies

Exclusions:

The following areas are explicitly excluded from the project scope:

- **Study of Technocratic Countries**: The project will not delve into in-depth investigations of countries primarily characterized by technocratic governance systems.
- Analysis of Major Technocratic Movements: Detailed analyses of specific technocratic movements or organizations are not within the project's purview.

• Interrelation of Technocracy with Current Evolving Technology: The project will not explore the interplay between technocracy and emerging technologies.

Constraints:

A notable constraint for this project is the presence of a time constraint, which necessitates efficient planning and execution of research activities to meet project deadlines.

Assumptions:

The project operates under the assumption that undemocratic aspects of technocracy may be adopted or adapted by democratic countries in certain situations, potentially affecting their decision-making processes.

This scope statement serves as a comprehensive guide for the research project, outlining its objectives, deliverables, inclusions, exclusions, constraints, and key assumptions. It will be used as a reference throughout the project's lifecycle to ensure that it remains focused and on track to achieve its research goals.

II. Research Phase:

A. Data Collection Methods:

1. Primary Data Collection (if applicable)

https://forms.gle/egzPaRMXjxLhnLSG9

2. Secondary Data Collection (sources, databases, articles, etc.)

Data dump with APA references:

What's wrong with technocracy?

The word "technocracy" has been around for a century, but as a term of political derision, it has flourished since the global financial crisis of 2008, especially in the context of the European Union's austerity-driven response to recession.

Unelected experts, whose positions shielded them from democratic accountability, overdetermined EU policy.

Early debates served as precursors to a 21st-century political struggle between experts and citizens.

This struggle is characterized as "wide-aperture, low-deference democracy" by political scientist Archon Fung.

The COVID-19 pandemic has intensified this conflict, highlighting issues in public health agencies like the CDC and economic institutions like the Federal Reserve.

Accusations include mismanagement, miscommunication, and deception.

Democratic citizens worldwide now face dependence on technocratic institutions but lack effective oversight and accountability mechanisms.

Technocracy is not just a populist paranoia but a real concern in contemporary politics.

Many people find the technocratic ideal appealing or acceptable, including liberal and progressive intellectuals.

Technocratic and meritocratic institutions have been embraced as a response to populist movements.

- Those concerned with good policy and democratic values should be cautious about embracing technocracy.
- Technocracy's connections to elite dominance and minority rule require careful examination.
- It's important to understand the exact definition of technocracy and when it becomes a concern for democracy.
- Recent scholarly work provides insights into the issues surrounding technocracy and offers guidance on how to construct a democratic opposition to it.

Concept of technocracy

The concept of technocracy has historical roots in utopian proposals for government.

- German philosopher Friedrich Engels, who preferred a communist state to regulate production rather than mediate political disputes, coined the phrase. and
- Engels also discussed the "withering away" of the state as part of this vision.
- In the 20th century, intellectuals like Thorstein Veblen in the United States and Walter Rathenau in Germany proposed government by engineers.
- This gave rise to a short-lived technocracy movement during the Great Depression, which advocated expert-led governance as a solution to economic problems.
- The term "technocracy" faded, but the idea of government by experts remained influential.
- In the United States, Progressive Era intellectuals and policymakers were divided on whether reform should be technocratic or democratic

In Lippmann's "realist" view, ordinary citizens were helplessly and hopelessly constrained by the narrowness of their perspectives and interests and therefore incapable of self-government. But experts and elites, he maintained, could still deliver the goods that people want from their governments if empowered to direct policy on the basis of social scientific knowledge. Dewey, while accepting much of Lippmann's account at the descriptive level, believed that more public discussion and decision-making—essentially more democracy—were mechanisms by which citizens could educate and organize themselves. Arguably, it was Lippmann's vision that prevailed in the early twentieth century, as top-down approaches to governance predominated in the New Deal era. In his book Democracy Against Domination (2016), legal scholar Sabeel K. Rahman explains that the New Deal pursued progressive ends

through a managerialist paradigm of economic governance wherein technocratic expertise was deployed toward the end of economic optimization.

- According to Walter Lippmann's "realist" viewpoint, common citizens are unable to govern themselves because of their limited perspectives and interests.
- He believed that experts and elites, armed with social scientific knowledge, could effectively govern to fulfill people's desires.
- The classical, or utopian, concept of technocracy involved direct rule by experts.
- European regimes like Hungary, the Czech Republic, Greece, and Italy appointed technocrats in response to the global financial crisis.
- However, both EU and U.S. policy responses to the crisis have been labeled technocratic, despite experts not directly governing in most cases.
- The justification for technocracy rests on the belief that experts can make superior decisions compared to the public or their representatives.
- Experts are seen as making the best decisions when insulated from political pressures, leading to depoliticized decision-making for efficiency reasons, according to Ignacio Sanchez-Cuenca.
- Technocracy is best understood as a collection of actors and institutions, typically at national or supranational levels.
- These entities concentrate power among unelected experts and have the authority to make binding decisions based on their expertise, not just offer advisory input.
- Such technocratic institutions are found within state bureaucracies and influence policies related to economics, national security, military, immigration, education, environment, and more.
- It is not crucial to definitively classify a political system as entirely technocratic or democratic since many exhibit elements of both.
- Instead of determining when a democracy "becomes" a technocracy, the focus should be on identifying illegitimate or undesirable forms of technocracy that hinder democratic decision-making capacities.
- The key is recognizing instances where technocracy preempts, excludes, or diminishes the democratic process.
- Technocratic domination is evident in various areas of policy, particularly in development policy, public health, infrastructure, and fiscal policy.
- Technocrats can influence elected politicians by controlling funds or overriding local institutions when given authority by national or supranational institutions.
- Technocrats may present their projects as apolitical but engage in political maneuvering to expand their influence and protect their autonomy.
- Examples include World Bank development projects in Lesotho and Brazilian development policy, both of which exacerbated political and economic inequalities.
- Technocratic domination is not limited to the developing world; it exists in economic policy in the United States and the EU.
- Central banks like the European Central Bank and the U.S. Federal Reserve are described as epitomes of technocratic power.

- The doctrine of central bank independence justifies a politics of "technocratic exceptionalism" that sidelines ordinary democratic politics to impose discipline on the state and limit citizens' distributive claims.
- The United States and the EU delegate significant decision-making power to administrative agencies with limited oversight from the public or elected officials.
- Scrutinizing the technocratic nature of these institutions raises questions about accountability and the need for potential reforms while recognizing that not all forms of bureaucracy are inherently malign or illegitimate.
- Technocracy disempowers citizens, contributing to the understanding of domination in modern democracies.
- While elite domination is often associated with economic elites, technocracy serves as both an independent source of domination and a means by which economic elite domination can be perpetuated and justified.
- Economic elites have better means to influence technocrats due to their organization and material advantages, allowing them to shape expert policy consensus.
- Policies benefiting economic elites often use technocratic language to present them as necessary rather than reflecting specific interests.
- Neither the production of expert knowledge nor its communication to the public is immune from distortion or capture.
- The tension between technocracy and democracy lies in the contrast between empowering experts and empowering the public.
- Proponents may view technocracy's limitation of democratic agency as a virtue or necessary tradeoff for better policymaking.
- To critique technology effectively, one should address its perceived strengths as well as weaknesses.
- Ordinary citizens possess a form of expertise and can effectively contribute to problem-solving.
- Citizens can assess scientific testimony, contribute to technical analysis, and evaluate norms of expert-citizen cooperation with the right institutional and cultural support.
- Although citizens may not be well-versed in all areas, they can have substantial knowledge
- about issues that directly affect them.
- This perspective goes beyond a narrow electoral conception of democracy, where voting for representatives is the primary mechanism for citizens to contribute knowledge.
- Elections provide limited choices loosely connected to policy agendas and outcomes, making other democratic forums more effective for knowledge aggregation and application.

Imagining "Smart Democracy":

- These arguments serve as a basis for envisioning more democratic practices and institutions that empower citizens and enhance the development, aggregation, and application of their knowledge.
- A "smart democracy" would empower citizens while facilitating the exchange of information and accountability between the technocratic and democratic realms.

- Analysts exploring expert-citizen relations have considered institutions that promote greater information exchange and accountability, which is crucial work.
- However, to address the critique of technocracy effectively, proposals for cultivating democratic intelligence through direct participatory decision-making channels are necessary.
- Democracy becomes smarter when citizens have decision-making power rather than just consulting power, making participatory governance a key element of "smart democracy."
- The critique of technocracy emphasizes that institutions isolating experts from democratic accountability or excluding policy decisions from public debate are unlikely to be successful.
- Growing dissatisfaction with democracy contributes to the allure of technocratic governance.
- Failures of conventional party politics and representative democracy to address crises lead to oscillations between technocratic management and populist insurgencies.
- Democrats must reconfigure institutions to balance responsiveness to populist demands with efficient integration of democratic and expert knowledge to prevent elite dominance.
- Implementing smart democracy infrastructure won't solve all injustices, exclusions, or hierarchies, but will empower citizens committed to these goals to expand the scope of politicization.
- Smart democracy doesn't close doors on radical political projects but provides a machinery of public power that reformers and radicals can use to create change.

(Cole, 2022, #)

IN SCIENCE, WE TRUST

Scott believed that people, freed from having to work for a living and secure in the knowledge that all their material needs would be taken care of, would be able to fulfill themselves through the arts, recreation, religion, or education, all of which would thrive in the Technate.

In his remarks at the 2017 World Government Summit, Musk acknowledged that a guaranteed basic income would only address a portion of the issue of technological unemployment. "The much harder challenge is, how are people going to have meaning?" Musk asked. "A lot of people derive their meaning from their employment. So if there's no need for your labor, what's your meaning? Do you feel useless? That's a much harder problem to deal with."

In its public outings, Technocracy Incorporated had an oddly militaristic look. Its members, both men and women, wore tailored gray suits and drove cars that they also painted gray. They greeted each other with salutes. "Those who create a civilization will eventually dominate it," Scott proclaimed in a speech in Winnipeg. "The engineers and mechanics created this civilization and will eventually dominate it." Technocracy was building "a technological army of the functionally competent."

This meant there would be no room or need for democracy. Experts chosen by their peers would oversee all of the standard government functions, including public safety, sanitation, and education. Doctors would vote for the person in charge of the health care system, teachers for the person who'd run the schools, and so on. There would be a cabinet made up of about a hundred of these experts, and they would select a "continental director" to oversee the whole thing.

This was how Technocracy planned to overcome its core complaint with democracy: that it led to too many incompetent people being in charge or that too many people made bad decisions because they lacked the necessary expertise or were motivated by profit, ambition or something else that would lead them astray

"There's a lack of focus on efficiency," lamented former Google executive chairman Eric Schmidt on a panel about government and technology in 2019. "The reason there's no innovation in government is that there are no bonuses for innovation. In fact, if you take a risk and it fails, your career is over."

People are tired and turned off by the commotion and disagreement of representative politics, according to Bertsou. "So it's this appeal of an efficient machine-like system... where problems can be identified through evidence, facts, and reason rather than ideological beliefs. I think that a lot of people find that appealing."

Bertsou believes that by insisting on finding the one correct solution to every problem, Technocracy has presented a false dichotomy. "There is not one type of scientific knowledge and no one way of governing social problems." (Basen, 2021)

THE UTOPIA OF RULES: Thesis: There appears to have been a profound shift, beginning in the 1970s, from investment in technologies associated with the possibility of alternative futures to investment technologies that furthered labor discipline and social control

Industrial Capitalism and Innovation:

• Industrial capitalism, since the 18th century, has driven rapid scientific and technological progress.

- Advocates argue that this progress justifies the exploitation and challenges it creates.
- Even critics like Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels acknowledged capitalism's capacity for technological advancement.

Shift in Technological Innovation:

- The pace of technological innovation in productive processes may have slowed in the 1950s and 1960s.
- The rivalry between the U.S. and the Soviet Union during the Cold War had some influence on this perception.
- The U.S. aimed to apply existing technologies to create a sense of prosperity and counter radical politics.

Soviet Influence on Technological Ambitions

- The Soviet Union's early successes in space exploration and economic growth challenged U.S. confidence.
- Soviet achievements, like launching Sputnik and manned spacecraft, raised concerns in the U.S.
- Soviet cosmic ambitions and grandiose projects influenced U.S. thinking.

Shift in Research and Development:

- After the moon landing in 1968, U.S. priorities shifted away from space exploration and toward military research.
- Research funds were channeled into military projects, impacting technological development.
- Robotics research, for instance, was largely directed toward military applications.

Impact of Tax Changes:

- Changes in tax regimes led to reduced corporate investment in research and development.
- Corporate profits were increasingly used for stock buybacks, benefiting executives but hindering research.

Information Technology and Surveillance:

- Information technology facilitated surveillance, work discipline, and social control.
- It enabled financialization of capital, increased worker debt, and flexible work regimes.
- Medical research has produced drugs like Prozac that address societal stress rather than curing diseases.

Neoliberalism and Political Imperatives:

- Neoliberalism prioritized political imperatives over economic ones.
- It depoliticized labor while negatively impacting economic growth.
- Neoliberalism aimed to quash the idea of a fundamentally different future.

Depoliticizing Labor and Expanding Security Services:

- Neoliberalism aimed to depoliticize labor, making it more pliable.
- The growth of security services and police contributed to resource sinks.
- These apparatuses may eventually undermine capitalism.

Summary of Neoliberalism's Effect:

- Neoliberalism prioritized capitalism's ideological victory over its economic viability.
- It sought to prevent the possibility of a fundamentally different future.
- The weight of the apparatus created to ensure capitalism's ideological dominance might ultimately undermine it.

<u>Antithesis: Yet even those areas of science and technology that did receive massive</u> <u>funding have not seen the breakthroughs originally anticipated</u>

- Despite significant funding in various scientific and technological areas, expected breakthroughs have not materialized as anticipated.
- Concerns about the disruptive effects of technological advancement, the economic effects of mechanization, and a desire to roll back gains made by progressive social movements led to changes in political priorities and resource allocation in the 1960s.
- Research funding has increased, with private enterprise now funding twice as much research as the government, but the results have been disappointing.
- "Big Science" projects, such as the Human Genome Project, tend to centralize research efforts, often driven by political, administrative, and marketing imperatives, limiting revolutionary outcomes.
- The idea that small, entrepreneurial research teams are responsible for driving innovation is false; bureaucratic culture and sizable projects are taking over research.
- Universities have seen a rise in administrative paperwork, diverting time and resources from actual research.
- The corporate ethos has encroached on academia, stifling creativity and fostering a culture of self-marketing.
- In the natural sciences, the privatization of research results and the decline of open-source collaboration have contributed to stagnation.

- Bureaucratic hurdles, competition, and a focus on immediate results discourage original thinking and innovation.
- The United States' dominance after World War II led to the corporatization of research institutions and a decline in tolerance for creative outliers.
- The bureaucratic culture that has emerged stifles scientific creativity and originality, favoring safe, well-established research paths over innovative ideas.

"All the labor-saving machinery that has hitherto been invented has not lessened the toil of a single human being."

—John Stuart Mill

- The book identifies a shift from "poetic technologies," where rational, bureaucratic means were used to bring imaginative, fantastical ideas to life, to "bureaucratic technologies," where administrative imperatives have become the primary goal of technological development.
- The author suggests that capitalism is not inherently technologically progressive, contrary to previous assumptions, and that it does not necessarily lead to widespread prosperity and democratic stability.
- Capitalism's claims to foster rapid technological development and overall prosperity are questioned in the context of contemporary society.
- The book highlights the need to reevaluate assumptions about the nature of capitalism and its relationship with the market and bureaucracy.
- It challenges the idea that capitalism is the only possible economic system for complex, technologically advanced societies.
- The author argues that capitalism attempts to suppress radical technological visions and convince people that the current system is the only viable option.
- While capitalism may slow down radical change, the pace of technological progress cannot be held back indefinitely, and breakthroughs will eventually occur.
- The book suggests that true innovation and invention are unlikely to happen within the framework of contemporary corporate capitalism.
- To address the challenges of the future, the author calls for a different economic system that promotes egalitarian wealth distribution and allows technology to serve human needs, breaking free from the influence of super-rich elites. (Graeber & The anarchist library, n.d., #)

AGAINST TECHNOCRATS:

- The notion that "hyperdemocratization" is causing issues in modern Western democracies is challenged. Dissatisfaction arises from a lack of democracy, where citizens view elites and institutions as unresponsive to their needs.
- In Europe, traditional political parties have lost members and voter trust, while technocratic elements in the European Union have undermined national democracy.
- The United States faces issues related to limitations on democracy, including the Electoral College, gerrymandering, and the influence of money in politics.
- The author emphasizes that rather than restricting democracy or promoting technocracy, efforts should focus on revitalizing democracy by making institutions and elites more responsive to the people's needs. (Berman & Dissent magazine, n.d., #)

EVERYONE LOVES A GOOD DROUGHT

The word 'rural development' is seemingly becoming more important in the last few decades owing to modernisation that swept the world after the Second World War. In the colonized worlds emerging from the western influence, development could not be realized through indigenous means of the nation In a country like India, which believes in self-sufficiency of food; holding on to the traditional trade; keeping up with the culture and us ing indigenous knowledge in medicine and other occupations, development suffered a setback owing to the industrial challenges faced in the post-colo nial world. When the country started its race in the tracks of development along with other countries, success could not be measured in indigenous terms anymore and the rubrics were set to international standards

The modern doctrine of development seems to have been inextricably bound with the rise in financial gain, infrastructure, and productivity. The development programmes designed by governmental and non-governmental The bodies have limitations owing to the power structure, corruption, and poor awareness, and other reasons unknown.

Winners take all

The world our youth grow up in, he writes, is one where the appeal of working for McKinsey or Goldman Sachs is greater than that of working for an NGO or government—even when your goal in life is to change the world.

A socially involved person like her would most likely end up joining the ranks of the government, a religious organization, or an NGO, but she instead chose to work for McKinsey.

As soon as people enter such companies, they realize that the majority of the projects there are not about doing good but about optimizing the profits of the company they consult.

The real problem with this situation, Giridharadas writes, is not the overpromising by companies to a younger generation of do-gooders. It is the truly held belief of these companies that all of the world's problems can be solved through "corporate social responsibility and philanthropy, and that taking on societal problems in an entrepreneurial way can be a "win-win" for the entrepreneurs and for the people they want to help.

But this ideology of the "harmony of human interests" doesn't check out, he writes. "It radically overestimates who will benefit from change," Greg Ferenstein, a former reporter at TechCrunch, tells him. In reality, suffering cannot be innovated away. In a market economy, some people will be left behind. " Win-lose is a more probable outcome if a benign government doesn't cooperate. There is profit to be made from misery, but it won't fundamentally end it.

Indeed, these platform monopolists allow everyone to be part of their platform but reap the majority of benefits for themselves and make major decisions without input from those they will affect. In this world, Giridharadas writes, users are like medieval peasants, and tech giants are like Leviathan princes. They turn back the clock by centuries rather than bring us to a brave new world.

Intellectuals and critics lost out to more agreeable "thought leaders." These TED-style thinkers "zoom in," focusing on individual opportunities in a way that is compatible with a win-win ideology. They talk about possibilities and self-improvement.

On the other hand, the critics who "zoom out to address systemic issues are out of favor with the business elites. They dare speak of inequality, its causes, and painful solutions, and they are told to tone it down. They speak of win-lose, a faux pas in the eyes of "philanthrocapitalists." Several people Giridharadas spoke to, including a TED speaker and foundation president, were in that situation. The result of all this, writes Giridharadas, is "the trying-to-Solve-the-PR issue, or the ones that caused it.

Even Michael Porter, the guru of modern enterprise theory, now has second thoughts on the effects of the doctrine he helped spread. "Somehow, in being efficient, clever, and productive, people thought they had the license to stop thinking about the well-being of everybody else in the system."

What that idea fails to capture, he writes, is that many people aren't left behind because of their inability to adapt to technological changes, as we like to believe, but because of their ancestry, color, or disability. And if that is true, if the playing field on which wealth is accumulated is not level and fair, should individuals be allowed to accumulate wealth on this scale in the first place?

The idea that the private sector can solve societal ills is only gaining traction. Initiatives like the (now defunct) Clinton Global Initiative, Bloomberg's Global Business Forum, and indeed the World Economic Forum tell commercial enterprises that it is good and right to do good *and* build their brands. "to return to politics as the place we go to shape the world." Don't try to change the world on your own, Chiara Cordelli, a philosopher, advises. "Support institutions that can, in the name of everyone, secure certain conditions for a more decent life."

"<u>GDP growth cannot in and of itself be relied upon</u> to generate inclusive socioeconomic progress." He therefore introduced new ways to measure the wealth of a nation, focusing on inequality.

(Vanham & Knowledge at Warton, October 18, 2018, #)

"Business elites are taking over the work of changing the world," Giridharadas observes. "Many believe they are changing the world when they may instead—or also—be protecting a system that is at the root of the problems they wish to solve." (social entrepreneurship are flourishing, and social impact consulting and impact investing have become established professions.)

Giridharadas suggests that we will never achieve social justice through "a system that perpetuates vast differences in privilege and then tasks the privileged with improving the system." The problem, as he sees it, is not just that those with privilege cannot truly understand the needs of those without, but rather that the mechanisms inherent in creating economic inequality cannot be used to reverse the imbalance.

We can talk about the victim and what she can do to fix the problem, but not about the perpetrator and what he must sacrifice to avoid recreating and perpetuating the problem.

Consider the example of Even, a VC-backed app designed for the millions of people with unpredictable incomes due to erratic shift schedules. For an annual fee of \$260, the app calculates a person's average earnings and reserves any excess earnings for the weeks when they earn less. Even though it is helpful when it comes to managing unpredictable cash flow, it doesn't solve other problems caused by erratic work schedules, such as scrambling to find last-minute childcare. However, isn't it unethical for investors to expect to make millions by requesting that people who are on the verge of poverty spend their own money to solve a problem that wealthy corporations' profit-maximizing decisions have created?

"that these precarious lives could be made less precarious if the kind of men who donated to [philanthropy] made investments differently, operated companies differently, managed wealth differently, donated to politicians... [and] lobbied differently." Even Darren Walker, president of the Ford Foundation, has learned that he must "inspire the rich to do more good but never ever tell them to do less harm; inspire them to give back but never ever tell them to take less." The winners never tell the losers that they need to change; rather, it is always the other way around.

What is the alternative? Giridharadas, quoting a Baha'i saying, contends that "social change is not a project that one group of people carries out for the benefit of another." Instead, he continues, we must solve problems "together in the public sphere through the tools of government and in the trenches of civil society... that give the people you are helping a say in the solutions [and] offer that say in equal measure to every citizen."

Giridharadas is right about the dangers of letting the winners shape solutions and the paradox of helping those who suffer from our economic system without changing that system.

Approaches such as cross-sector coalitions using the collective impact framework, "positive deviance" problem-solving strategies, and human-centered design all bring the insights of those we hope to help to those who have the power to make change in ways that circumvent at least some of Giridharadas' concerns. Besides, we must acknowledge that activist mega-donors from Silicon Valley, global corporations, social entrepreneurs, strategy consultants, and impact investors have brought dynamic and powerful new ways of achieving social impact. It would be an immense loss if we completely rejected the innovations they have brought.

If we are blind to the self-interest that delimits their innovations, if we dare not offend these new masters by acknowledging their conflicts of interest and hypocrisies, if we pretend that social justice can be achieved without changing the government corruption or the cruel and exploitive version of capitalism that exists in our country today, then we are deluding ourselves with false hope. We cannot have our cake and give it away too. We must keep the winners engaged, but we must also hold them accountable.

(Kramer & Stanford social innovation review, Fall 2018, #)

The world is progressing quickly. It seems all around us, advancements in technology and productivity are making things better for everyone. Our lives are surely easier today in a lot of ways, but are we getting all of the benefits of these improvements?

Unfortunately, while we might think of the many progressive movements going on around us, the majority of people don't benefit from them. It's the elite that suck up almost all the potential good that comes from societal growth.

For example:

Take a problem like <u>productivity</u>. It seems simple enough, right? A Silicon Valley go-getter might think it's a great idea to build software that helps people and companies improve their efficiency. Couldn't everyone benefit from something like that?

It turns out this approach is solving the wrong problem. Productivity has already been increasing dramatically in the last few years. **Some estimates say that between 1973 and 2014, it's gone up 70%!** But the distribution of the benefits isn't going to reach everyone.

For the average worker, their income has only gone up about 10% for that massive increase in performance. In other words, the elite took the benefit!

(Rowley, 2020)

Seeing like a state

I shall argue that **the most tragic episodes of state-initiated social engineering originate in a pernicious combination of four elements**. All four are necessary for a full-fledged disaster.

- 1. The first element is **the administrative ordering of nature and society**—the transformative state simplifications described above.
- 2. The second element is what I call a high-modernist ideology. It is best conceived as a strong, one might even say muscle-bound, version of self-confidence about scientific and technical progress, the expansion of production, the growing satisfaction of human needs, the mastery of nature (including human nature), and, above all, the rational design of social order commensurate with the scientific understanding of natural laws.
- 3. The third element is **an authoritarian state that is willing and able to use the full weight of its coercive power to bring these high-modernist designs into being...** The most fertile soil for this element has typically been times of war, revolution, depression, and struggle for national liberation.
- 4. A fourth element is closely linked to the third: a prostrate civil society that lacks the capacity to resist these plans.

The state has no monopoly on utilitarian simplifications. What the state does at least aspire to, though, is a monopoly on the legitimate use of force.

The first is **the aspiration to the administrative ordering of nature and society**, **an aspiration that we have already seen at work in scientific forestry**, **but one raised to a far more comprehensive and ambitious level**. "High modernism" seems an appropriate term for this aspiration.

The second element is **the unrestrained use of the power of the modern state as an instrument for achieving these designs.**

The third element is a weakened or prostrate civil society that lacks the capacity to resist these plans. The ideology of high modernism provides, as it were, the desire; the modern state provides the means of acting on that desire; and the incapacitated civil society provides the leveled terrain on which to build (dis)utopias.

There is no denying that much of the massive, state-enforced social engineering of the twentieth century has been the work of progressive, often revolutionary, elites.

The potential obstacles to high-modernist planning and the particular barrier posed by liberal democratic ideas and institutions deserve emphasis. Three factors seem decisive.

- 1. The first is the existence and belief in a private sphere of activity in which the state and its agencies may not legitimately interfere. Much of the work of Michel Foucault was an attempt to map these incursions into health, sexuality, mental illness, vagrancy, or sanitation and the strategies behind them. Nevertheless, the idea of a private realm has served to limit the ambitions of many high modernists, either through their own political values or their healthy respect for the political storm that such incursions would provoke.
- 2. **The second, closely related factor is the private sector in liberal political economy**. As Foucault put i,: unlike absolutism and mercantilism, "political economy announces the unknowability for the sovereign of the totality of economic processes and, as a consequence, the impossibility of an economic sovereignty."
- 3. The third and by far most important barrier to thoroughgoing high-modernist schemes has been the existence of working, representative institutions through which a resistant society could make its influence felt.

High-modernist schemes in liberal democratic settings must accommodate themselves sufficiently to local opinion in order to avoid being undone at the polls.

Most states, to speak broadly, are "younger" than the societies that they purport to administer. States therefore confront patterns of settlement, social relations, and production, not to mention a natural environment, that have evolved largely independently of state plans. The result is typically a diversity, complexity, and unrepeatability of social forms that are relatively opaque to the state, often purposefully so.

EXAMPLE:

7 Compulsory Villagizations in Tanzania: Aesthetics and Miniaturization

The Ujamaa village campaign in Tanzania from 1973 to 1976 was a massive attempt to permanently settle most of the country's population in villages, of which the layouts, housing designs, and local economies were planned, partly or wholly, by officials of the central government.

Authoritarian social engineering is apt to display the full range of standard bureaucratic pathologies. The transformations it wishes to effect cannot generally be brought about without applying force or without treating nature and human subjects as if they were functions in a few administrative routines. Far from being regrettable anomalies, these behavioral by-products are inherent in high-modernist campaigns of this kind.

Communal ties, relations with kin and affines, networks of reciprocity and cooperation, local charity, and dependence had been the principal means by which villagers had managed to survive periods of food shortage in the past. Stripped of these social resources by indiscriminate deportations, often separated from their immediate family and forbidden to leave, the settlers in the camps were far more vulnerable to starvation than they had been in their home regions.

In their perfect legibility and sameness, these villages would be ideal, substitutable bricks in an edifice of state planning. Whether they would function was another matter.

It is far easier for would-be reformers to change the formal structure of an institution than to change its practices. Redesigning the lines and boxes in an organizational chart is simpler than changing how that organization actually operates.

Just as the architectural drawing, the model, and the map are ways of dealing with a larger reality that is not easily grasped or manageable in its entirety, the miniaturization of high-modernist development offers a visually complete example of what the future looks like.

The planned city, the planned village, and the planned language (not to mention the command economy) are, as we have emphasized, likely to be thin cities, villages, and languages. They are thin in the sense that they cannot reasonably plan for anything more than a few schematic aspects of the inexhaustibly complex activities that characterize "thick" cities and villages.

One all-but-guaranteed consequence of such thin planning is that the planned institution generates an unofficial reality—a "dark twin"—that arises tofulfill many of the various needs that the planned institution fails to fulfill.

Nearly every new, exemplary capital city has, as the inevitable accompaniment of its official structures, given rise to another, far more "disorderly" and complex city that makes the official city work—that is virtually a condition of its existence.

The most rigidly planned economies tend to be accompanied by large "underground, 'gray, or informa," economies that supply, in a thousand ways, what the formal economy fails to supply.

"Machines are not made to harvest crops," noted two proponents of phytoengineering. "In reality, crops must be designed to be harvested by machine." Having been adapted to the cultivated field, the crop was now adapted to mechanization. The "machine-friendly" crop was bred to incorporate a series

of characteristics that made it easier to harvest it mechanically. Among the most important of these characteristics were resilience, a concentrated fruit set, uniformity of plant size and architecture, uniformity of fruit shape and size, dwarfing (in the case of tree crops especially), and fruits that easily break away from the plant.

Diversity is the enemy of epidemics. In a field with many species of plants, only a few individuals are likely to be susceptible to a given pathogen, and they are likely to be widely scattered. The mathematical logic of the epidemic is broken.

Like the formal order of the planned section of Braslia or collectivized agriculture, modern, simplified, and standardized agriculture depends for its existence on a "dark twin" of informal practices and experience, on which it is ultimately parasitic.

Polyculture, like the tropical forest itself, plays an important role in protecting thin soils from the erosive effects of wind, rain, and sunlight.

The city desk of a newspaper, a rabbit's intestines, or the interior of an aircraft engine may certainly look messy, but each one reflects, sometimes brilliantly, an order related to the function it performs. In such instances, apparently, the apparent surface disarray obscures a more profound logic.

The diversity and complexity that cause systems of flora to become more durable and resilient work, apparently at another level, to cause human communities to become more nimble and satisfactory. Shifting cultivation is an exceptionally complex and hence quite illegible form of agriculture from the perspective of a sovereign state and its extension agents. The fields themselves are "fugitive," going in and out of cultivation at irregular intervals—hardly promising material for a cadastral map.

"The proper test for any practice was whether it worked in the environment concerned, not whether it looked 'advanced' or 'backward.' Testing requires carefully controlled input-output trials. If 'shallow' cultivation on 'partially cleared' land gives better returns relative to the inputs expended than rival systems, and these results can be sustained over time, then the technique is a good one, irrespective of whether it was invented yesterday or a thousand years ago."

If your life depended on your ship coming through rough weather, you would surely prefer a successful captain with long experience to, say, a brilliant physicist who had analyzed the natural laws of sailing but who had never actually sailed a vessel.

Technical knowledge, or techne, could be expressed precisely and comprehensively in the form of hard-and-fast rules (not rules of thumb), principles, and propositions.

Where metis is contextual and particular, techne is universal. Ten times ten equals one hundred in the logic of mathematics, always and everywhere.

The rules of techne are the specifications of how knowledge is to be codified, expressed, and verified once it has been discovered. No rules of techne or episteme can explain scientific invention and insight.

What has proved to be truly dangerous to us and to our environment, I think, is the combination of the universalist pretensions of epistemic knowledge and authoritarian social engineering.

How rare it is to encounter advice about the future that begins with the premise of incomplete knowledge.

Take small steps. In an experimental approach to social change, we presume that we cannot know the consequences of our interventions in advance. Given this postulate of ignorance, I prefer, wherever possible, to take a small step, stand back, observe, and then plan the next small move.

Favor reversibility. Prefer interventions that can easily be undone if they turn out to be mistakes. Irreversible interventions have irreversible consequences.

Plan on surprises. Choose plans that allow the largest amount of accommodation for the unexpected. **Plan on human inventiveness**. Always plan under the assumption that those who become involved in the project later will have or will develop the experience and insight to improve the design.

(Liason, n.d.)

Seeing like a state

Reduce complexity:

James Scott asserts that no government system is able to accurately represent a real-life community as it requires a significant reduction in complexity. The complexity of a community is so vast that it cannot be fully captured through bureaucratic methods.

The state does not aim to document the complete social reality, just like a forester does not aim to document the entire ecology of a forest. Up until the 19th century, taxation, control, and conscription were the main objectives that guided state agents' abstractions and simplifications. These objectives only require basic techniques and understanding.

Centralize local practices:

Each state project reflects a pattern of interaction between local knowledge and practices, on the one hand, and state administrative procedures, on the other. This pattern recurs throughout the book. In each case, the state found the raw form of local practices of measurement and land ownership to be unreadable. They showed a complexity that was rooted in a variety of local, not state, priorities. This means that the state could not incorporate them into its administrative framework without either modifying or simplifying them into a manageable, though partially imaginary, representation. *The homogenous citizen (the beginning of modern France):*

The standardization of measures was closely tied to the political idea of uniform citizenship. In a society where different groups of people were treated as unequal in law, it was also possible for them to have unequal rights with regards to measures.

The Encyclopedists believed that the confusing array of measurements, laws, taxes, and regulations was a barrier to the French becoming a unified people. They envisioned a series of centralizing reforms that would create a single national community where the same laws, measures, beliefs, and customs would be used everywhere. The concept of national citizenship, where a French national would experience the same fair and equal conditions throughout the kingdom, was central to this vision.

Instead of a myriad of small communities that were difficult to understand for outsiders, the Encyclopedists wanted to create a single national society that was perfectly legible from the center. The goal was not only administrative convenience but also the transformation of the French people. The uniformity of customs, beliefs, and principles of action would lead to greater unity among the people. The concept of equal citizenship would create a new reality: the French citizen.

- In ancient Greek philosophy, there are three types of knowledge: episteme, techne, and mētis.
- Episteme represents universal, impersonal knowledge based on logical deduction from first principles.
- Techne is characterized by precise rules and principles and is also universal and impersonal, making it similar to modern scientific knowledge.
- Mētis, on the other hand, is contextual, situational, and particular, often associated with practical, local knowledge.
- Techne is ideal for codifying and expressing knowledge but cannot explain the creative process of knowledge generation.
- The evolution of neoclassical economics exemplifies the emphasis on quantifiable, predictable factors, excluding unpredictable elements like entrepreneurship.
- Practical knowledge is economical and tailored to specific local needs, making it effective for addressing local problems.
- Mētis often involves vernacular, context-specific measures and classifications, which may convey more relevant information than abstract measures.
- Practical knowledge relies on meticulous observation and experimentation driven by personal interest and necessity.
- Communities value practical knowledge for its ability to solve problems.
- Disdain for practical knowledge can be attributed to professional rivalry, modernism's disregard for tradition, and the scientific requirement for controlled experimental evidence.

(Oliphant, n.d.)

Governing the commons

The study focuses on the management of shared resources and challenges conventional solutions such as government regulation or privatization.

Elinor Ostrom introduces the concept of "common pool resources," such as fisheries, groundwater basins, and irrigation systems, which are often overexploited due to self-interest.

She proposes a third approach: creating durable cooperative institutions governed by resource users themselves.

The central question is how to organize and govern interdependent resource users to achieve collective benefits despite temptations to free-ride or act opportunistically.

Ostrom analyzes various successful common property regimes like Swiss pastures, Japanese forests, and irrigation systems in Spain and the Philippines.

She identifies eight common "design principles," including clear boundaries, user monitors, graduated sanctions, and user-dominated conflict resolution mechanisms.

The goal is to foster contingent self-commitment among members to follow the rules, except in dire emergencies.

The book is aimed at policymakers, bureaucrats, and resource users, emphasizing effective resource management over explanatory theories.

Ostrom criticizes generalized theories of collective action, such as the tragedy of the commons and the prisoners' dilemma, for not considering specific conditions.

These models are only applicable when individuals have high discount rates, low mutual trust, no communication or binding agreements, and no monitoring and enforcement mechanisms. Ostrom's main objective is to challenge the belief that external authorities imposing private property rights or centralized regulation are the only solutions to common pool resource problems.

(Ostrom & London, n.d.)

After assessing if and to what extent the original design principles are useful for the study of global commons and analyzing how they can be reinterpreted in order to become more useful, Stern continues to develop a set of additional principles. Leaning on, among others, <u>Dietz et al. (2003)</u>, Stern arrives at the following preliminary list of design principles for the global commons:

- 1. Invest in science to understand the resource and its interactions with users and those affected by its use;
- 2. Establish independent monitoring of the resource and its use that is accountable to a range of interested and affected parties;
- 3. Ensure meaningful participation of the parties in framing questions for analysis, defining the import of scientific results, and developing rules;
- 4. Integrate scientific analysis with broadly based deliberation;
- 5. Higher-level actors should facilitate participation of lower-level actors;

- 6. Engage and connect a variety of institutional forms from local to global in developing rules, monitoring, and sanctioning; and,
- 7. Plan for institutional adaptation and change.

Stern illustrates the use of these design principles for the global commons by applying them to the governance of emerging technologies. New and emerging technologies often present common problems, many of them global, when their implementation creates externalities in the form of risks of harm to parties beyond the set of users: common-pool hazards.

- The main goal of Anthony and Campbell (2011) is to explore the role of the state and social capital in shaping people's propensity to cooperate for long-term common benefits.
- They emphasize that Elinor Ostrom's work in "Governing the Commons" expanded our understanding of social capital but lacked theoretical discussions about the state's role.
- States can either be predatory or benevolent, impacting cooperative behavior and resource management.
- The state can provide resources and legitimacy and influence the perception of cooperation's costs and benefits.
- The Newfoundland cod fisheries case illustrates how the state can unwittingly contribute to resource destruction.
- Trust, knowledge, reputations, and repeated interactions all have an impact on social capital, which is crucial in encouraging cooperative behavior.
- Anthony and Campbell discuss the governance of the internet and how state policies like Net Neutrality shape self-governing commons.
- Rudel (2011) examines the relationship between political and economic development, social capital, and the emergence of common property institutions.
- Social capital at the community level requires both bonding and bridging, while at the larger societal level, it involves embedded autonomy.
- Rudel highlights key variables from Ostrom's work and development sociology literature to analyze the impact of development on common property institutions.
- Acheson (2011) surveys Elinor Ostrom's work, emphasizing themes like collective action problems, rule classification, and the management of common-pool resources.
- Ostrom's classification system for rules (ADICO syntax) helps clarify the concepts of rules, norms, and shared strategies in resource management.
- Acheson suggests that Ostrom's work addresses complex problems with complex theoretical schemes.
- Since 1994, Acheson and James Wilson have pushed for a novel approach to fisheries management that is based on chaos and complexity theory.

(Berge & Laerhoven, 14 Sep 2011, #)

Urban planners tend to be experts who have a clear idea of how an agglomeration should reasonably develop. Unfortunately, they often lack an understanding of many relevant issues that should be taken into consideration. For several reasons, it is actually impossible to understand everything that matters.

- First of all, urban settings foster self-organized behavior, much of which authorities are not even aware of. Slum settlements, for example, are often beyond the reach of law enforcement and almost always unplanned. Nonetheless, people survive there, and their community life is widely self-organized. Urban planners may see informal settlements as problems, but to the people living there, they are solutions: this is where they have a home and where many of them work. Self-organization matters in other respects too. For example, businesses network among one another, religious communities and social movements spread, and traffic patterns evolve.
- Cities are where change happens and political challenges arise. Technology, migration, and political uprisings are just three catchwords. Cities keep transforming, so what planners consider normal today may not be obvious at all tomorrow.
- Urban land is expensive, and vested interests have a bearing on development, but they are not necessarily aligned with urban planning. All over the world, the incidence of corruption pertaining to urban affairs is particularly high, which shows that urban planners cannot simply implement the common good.

The better urban planners know their agglomeration and its diverse communities, the better they will perform. They must not withdraw into fancy office buildings to draft grand schemes but must engage with the public. They should realistically assess why so many grand plans fail. An approach one might call "agora" planning would make sense. "Agora" is the ancient Greek word for the market places that, like Rome's Forum, also served public debate.

To make a relevant difference, planners must take an inclusive approach. The more voices they hear and the more perspectives they share, the better they can rise to the challenges. They need to take into account inconvenient truths as well as powerful vested interests. To overcome major obstacles, they will have to forge big coalitions involving different social forces. Top-down approaches, however, are bound to fail.

The agora approach should not only be taken in megacities like Lagos, Lahore, or Lima. For several reasons, competent agora planning is at least as important in smaller towns. One reason is that smaller towns grow faster than big ones. Another one is that they are becoming more diverse, and multiculturalism is becoming the norm. Unlike in megacities, it is impossible to withdraw into secluded communities. (Korff, 2016, #)

To test the empirical implications of our theory, we fielded nationally representative surveys in Germany, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom in October 2017. Ipsos was in charge of conducting the surveys. Respondents were drawn from Ipsos' online panel, and hard quotas were applied to several key

demographics. Specifically, our samples are nationally representative with regards to age, education, gender, and geographical region within each country. The sample includes approximately 2100 respondents per country (2100 in Switzerland, 2101 in Germany, and 2117 in the United Kingdom, for a total of 6318 respondents). The case selection allows us to assess our theoretical arguments in a variety of contexts. The three countries, Germany, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom, vary not only in the amount of direct democratic decision-making but also in their electoral systems (Qvortrup, 2014). Switzerland puts a strong emphasis on direct democracy, an element that is largely absent in Germany and the United Kingdom (Qvortrup, 2014). Citizens' willingness to delegate may thus systematically vary according to their exposure to direct democracy. The countries at hand also differ in the degrees of proportionality and varying clarity of accountability of their political systems. Thus, the particular context will have an impact on citizens' attitudes toward parliamentary decision-making. Additionally, majoritarian institutions may, for example, increase the average distance between citizens and parliament, which in turn should affect their sensitivity to their own positions and other policymaking processes. While our theoretical argument does not point to particular commonalities or differences in the role of issue positions across the three countries, testing our hypotheses in these three countries allows us to assess the extent to which the results are generalizable and travel across political contexts. We focus on three policy issues to examine the relationship between individuals' issue positions and preferences towards delegation: immigration, nuclear power, and marijuana legalization. We chose these issue areas for the following reasons: First, the literature on policy delegation argues that delegation is not a useful tool to address distributive problems. Policies that distribute resources to different groups require normative guidance. Experts are not necessarily equipped to make these decisions because they cannot make normative statements based on their technical expertise. In contrast, issues like monetary policy, while having a substantial impact on society, are considered to require technical expertise (Lohmann, 1998) and independence, a central reason to delegate to experts (see Alesina & Tabellini, 2007, 2008, for an extensive discussion). Second, these issues vary in terms of public salience. When designing the study, we asked individuals to choose up to three items that they considered important issues in their country. In our sample, approximately 42% (immigration) and 19% (nuclepower), respectively, of respondents considered the respective issue area to be one of the most important issues. Individuals who received treatment were randomly assigned answers about one of these issues (individuals in the control group responded to questions concerning all three issues to increase statistical power). To experimentally manipulate perceptions of expert opinions, we rely on a survey-embedded experiment. Individuals in the treatment arm of the survey proceed in the following manner: For illustrative purposes, we will use the example of nuclear power and the UK survey (also displayed in Figure 1). 1. Following a brief introductory statement, respondents are asked to position themselves on a scale where the extremes are to 'greatly reduce nuclear power' or 'greatly increase nuclear power', with the middle point being the status quo (i.e., maintain the current level of nuclear power), as in the first part of Figure 1. This question allows us to capture the distance from the status quo. 7 2. After this, respondents are randomly assigned to receive information about how experts either favor an increase or decrease in nuclear power, using real quotations from two physicists, as shown in Respondents are then returned to the scale where they previously the second part of Figure 1. 3. positioned themselves. Added to this scale is the expert's 'position' given individuals' previous statements in step 1, as in the lowest part of Figure 1. The expert holds either liberal (0.88) or

conservative (0.8) positions. 4. Respondents then answer a manipulation check, with the item asking whether the experts supported more, less, or the same amount of nuclear power as the respondents do. Thereby, we ensure that individuals are aware of the distance between themselves, the status quo, and the experts. 5. Finally, respondents respond to the question that constitutes the dependent variable in our analysis (see the subsequent section), namely, who should have policymaking authority. Those in the control group engage in the first and fifth tasks outlined above (stating their position and choosing whom to delegate too) without any contextual information about experts. With this design, we capture all the spatial information necessary to test Hypotheses 1a to 3 To capture the societal ideal policy position, we calculate the average position of individuals' ideal policy positions for a given issue within a given country. The distance between this point and an individual's policy position allows us to test Hypothesis 3. Figure 2 displays the distribution of policy preferences and the mean position across countries and policy areas. The value of zero indicates the status quo, while +1 indicates more liberal policy positions (more immigration, less nuclear power, and higher legalization of marijuana), and 1 indicates more conservative policy positions (less immigration, more nuclear power, and more criminalization of marijuana). While we could have randomly assigned societal ideal points, this information would have been less credible and more likely to fail in manipulating citizens' perceptions. Thus, we decided to use available information, which most likely represents citizens' perceived societal position on most issues. A potential concern with using these aggregated preferences as a measure of the public's perception of the demos' position is that individuals' may hold biased perceptions of others' preferences. For example, individuals may believe that the demos' position is closer to their own than it is in reality, as documented in previous psychological research (e.g., Tversky & Kahneman, 1974). For our empirical analysis, such a bias in perceptions would likely lead to attenuation bias, which would minimize the perceived differences between an individual's policy position and that of the demos. In the conclusion, we discuss potential avenues for exploring this issue further in future research. Please summarise this in bullet points

In this study, we argue that an individual's willingness to delegate policymaking away from parliament in a given policy area depends on her policy position vis-à-vis parliament. That is, if the distance between an individual's and the parliament's ideal points is large for a given policy issue, the individual will prefer delegating policymaking authority away from the parliament. We also contend that the salience of the issue to the individual affects this effect. Other societal ideals become relevant when choosing whom to delegate decision-making authority to, if not the parliament. The choice of whom to delegate to inpositions either a technocratic (independent agency) or populist (referenda) mode of decision-making depends on the policy position of experts and the public, respectively. This implies that individuals maximise their utility by choosing the option that is closest to their policy preferences and thus promises to result in the most favoured outcome. Original nationally representative survey data (N = 6₃₁8 in total) from three European countries (the United Kingdom, Germany and Switzerland) support our theoretical arguments. Our research contributes to the literature on citizens' process preferences with regards to alternative democratic decision-making procedures. Starting with Hibbing and Theiss-Morse (2002), the literature has argued for a long time that decision-making preferences are quite stable (Bowler et al., 2007), whereas only more recent literature has assessed the support for direct democracy through the lens of outcome favourability (Esaiasson et al., 2016; Landwehr & Harms, 2019; Werner, 2020). Our findings lend additional support for the outcome favourability arguments and raise doubts about how stable the support for democratic decision-making procedures is (Bowler et al., 2007). Moreover, the analysis of citizens' preferences concerning delegation of policymaking to technocratic governance has received little attention (Bertsou & Pastorella, 2017), and it is here where we shed new light on. Until now, most of the literature on individuals' support for different decision-making processes does not consider potential trade-offs between these different decision-making modes (for a notable exception, see Coffé & Michels, 2014). By contrasting competing alternatives, we are able to examine preferences for one process vis-à-vis other alternatives. Additionally, our case selection allows us to assess our theoretical arguments in countries with different political systems regarding the degree of accountability, representativeness and direct democracy. Our findings also have implications for understanding how citizens relate to representation and representative democracy in general. The results suggest that the dominant approach in the current literature, which examines general attitudes towards democracy and representation, misses considerable variation by policy issues. By not considering issue-specific justifications for delegation to referenda, prior research does not fully distinguish support for direct democracy writ large from support for policies in salient issue areas. Indeed, we find considerable heterogeneity based upon individuals' policy preferences, the specific issue and the position of experts and the public at large. In times of 'anti-politics' (Hay & Stoker, 2009) and 'populist zeitgeist' (Mudde, 2004; Rooduijn et al., 2014), representative democracy faces particularly severe pressure (Huber & Ruth, 2017). However, expressions of discontent are often issue-specific and may reflect the salience of particular issues. While this study provides a starting point for better understanding delegation, it also implies venues for future research. First, we explicitly focus on a spatial, instrumental logic rooted in the literature on outcome favourability (Esaiasson et al., 2016). This also seems important in the light of our findings as perceptions of responsiveness are likely to be issue-specific. Second and related, we focus on three issue areas of differing salience, namely immigration, nuclear power and the legalisation of marijuana. Future research could look into other issue areas. Thereby, research could compare issue areas that align and are orthogonal to the economic left-right axis or explicitly allow the level of technical complexity to vary to understand whether individuals consider this dimension as argued by Alesina and Tabellini (2007, 2008). Finally, our results for the effect of the demos' position suggest variation in the underlying rationale to support referenda. In particular, they indicate that liberals support referenda as a decision-making process, regardless of whether the demos' position is close or not to their preferred position. One potential explanation for this is that liberals hold a stronger belief that citizens should be involved and accept outcomes regardless of their own preferences. Conservative respondents, on the other hand, seem to only support referenda if they expect them to lead to their preferred outcome. For conservative respondents and referenda, hence, the instrumental logic applies. Further research could more explicitly examine this question, for example, by seeking to manipulate individuals' perceptions of societal positions and measuring potential mechanisms. Research in political psychology suggests that citizens have biased perceptions of societal ideals, as understood in this article (e.g., Tversky & Kahneman, 1974). Future research could scrutinize the process through which individuals form second-order beliefs and how this matters for delegation preferences. Please summarise in bullet points (Beiser-McGrath et al., 2021, #)

Case study of technocratic governance in Singapore: COVID-19 outbreak

Singapore's technocratic model has been key to its overall successful delivery of healthcare to the Singapore population [16] and, more recently, its prompt responses to the COVID-19 pandemic, though not without shortfalls. [17] For instance, the government's delayed response to the COVID-19 outbreak in the migrant worker dormitories was a notable mistake, with 175,000 out of 323,000, or 54% of dormitory residents, having caught the virus by the end of 2021. [18]

As technocracy seeks to bring the greatest benefit to the majority, it is unsurprising that peripheralized and vulnerable minorities might be left behind. COVID-19, being an unprecedented global health crisis, exemplified the blind spots that might arise out of scenario planning. This is corroborated by Prime Minister Lee Hsien Loong during a December 2020 interview, in which he admitted, "we were prepared but not enough … we [had] to manage the dorms in a different way from the way they have been handled." [18]

Therefore, the Singapore government has to consistently shore up its technocratic model with support schemes targeted at the weaker members of society. For more people to reap the benefits of technocracy, the government must bridge the gap between expedient governance and social equity through the active inclusion of various interest groups in its planning.

Democratic feedback as the key driver for technocratic governance

Democratic feedback is critical for a technocracy to flourish. The Singapore government has attempted to hold deliberations through surveys and social media that grant civil servants the data they require to modify and improve policies. By marrying data with democracy and foresight with feeling, [19] technocrats can more effectively capture the public's interests, taking into account the needs of different segments of society.

Understandably, a democracy or technocracy cannot on its own guarantee "good" governance, which in itself is a subjective, contested concept. For Plato, an ideal *polis* would consist of a wise ruling class and an educated citizenry; democracy without these features would result in a free but dangerously anarchic society liable to tyranny. [20] Technocracies do not have philosopher-kings, but instead have engineer-kings and scientist-kings who use their domain knowledge to expertly steer policy. In contrast, a liberal democracy would limit the government's powers and modes of action under the rule of law while protecting individual freedoms. [21] Ideally, governance should incorporate the best of both worlds: the administrative efficiency and performance-driven characteristics of technocracy, along with the civic participation and protection of individual rights from democracy.

Nevertheless, against a global backdrop of democratic backsliding [22], perhaps Plato was right. With the declining ideological dominance of the West [23], more countries are increasingly paying attention to Singapore as a technocratic model to emulate. [24]

By leveraging the best techniques and practices, proper technocratic regimes are dynamic, agile, and resilient. If technocracy is the way of the future, then Asian technocracies—likely with Singapore at the helm—will forge the way. (*The Spiral Staircase: An Analysis of Technocratic Governance in Singapore*, 2022)

B. Data Sources and References:

1. List of Sources Consulted

What is wrong with technocracy? In science we trust | CBCnews The utopia of rules by David Graeber Against the technocrats Winners take all by Anand Giridhardas: 1. Review knowledge at wharton 2. Stanford social innovation review 3. Fourminutebooks.com Seeing Like a State by James C. Scott: 1. Nate liaison 2. Wisewords.blog Governing the Commons by Elinor Ostrom: 1. London Scott 2. International journal of the commons D+C, Listen to everyone Sage journal The convergence

2. Bibliography or References (APA or MLA format)

References

Basen, I. (2021, June 28). In science, we trust CBC News.

https://newsinteractives.cbc.ca/longform/technocracy-incorporated-elon-musk/

Berman, S., & Dissent magazine. (n.d.). Against the technocrats. (winter 2018).

https://www.dissentmagazine.org/article/against-technocrats-liberal-democracy-history/

Cole, M. B. (2022, August 22nd). What's Wrong with Technocracy? Boston review.

https://www.bostonreview.net/articles/whats-wrong-with-technocracy/

Graeber, D., & The Anarchist library. (n.d.). The utopia of rules

https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/david-graeber-the-utopia-of-rules

C. Data Preprocessing:

- 1. Cleaning and Organizing data; Condensing the data.
- Handling Missing or Inconsistent Data Adding more information in cases of inconsistency.
- Data Validation and Verification Verified sources such as books and case study research.

III. Data Analysis and Insights:

A. Data Visualization Techniques Used:

1. Selection of Appropriate Charts and Graphs

Layout analysis:

https://www.canva.com/design/DAFuIRRzoPo/7XBSPHmPKtHMQHRvxbl9pg/edit?utm

Layout practices:

https://www.canva.com/design/DAFtSFB1KNo/pQ1ogwrinh6-iPXoQfphaw/edit?utm_co ntent=DAFtSFB1KNo&utm_campaign=designshare&utm_medium=link2&utm_source =sharebutton

2. Justification for Visualization Choices

B. Key Insights Derived from Data:

1. Summarized Findings and Trends

The political landscape of the 21st century is characterized by a struggle between experts and citizens over the role of experts in governance.

Technocratic institutions concentrate power among unelected experts who make binding decisions based on their expertise, influencing a variety of policy domains, such as development, public health, infrastructure, and fiscal policy.

Some individuals are attracted to the concept of technocracy because they desire a more efficient and rational system of governance, in which decisions are based on evidence, facts, and reason as opposed to ideological beliefs.

False Dichotomy: According to critics, technocracy's insistence on finding a single correct solution to every problem is a false dichotomy, since there is more than one type of scientific knowledge and more than one method of governing social issues. This indicates that technocratic approaches may oversimplify complicated issues.

To address future challenges, the book proposes an alternative economic system that promotes egalitarian wealth distribution and allows technology to serve human needs while escaping the influence of super-rich elites.

In contemporary Western democracies, problems are not caused by "hyperdemocratization" but by a perceived lack of democracy, in which elites and institutions are perceived as unresponsive to citizens' needs.

There are limitations on government and non-government development programs due to power structures, corruption, and a lack of awareness, among other factors.

Platform monopolists, such as tech giants, have the most control and benefit from their platforms, while users have limited input. This situation is likened to that of medieval peasants and Leviathan princes, which impedes the advancement of society.

Business elites are increasingly involved in social impact and philanthropy, but this may not address the root causes of social problems because it may unintentionally protect the system that perpetuates these problems.

Economic inequality cannot be reversed with the same mechanisms that led to its creation. The privileged cannot fully comprehend the requirements of the disadvantaged, and their solutions may not address systemic issues.

Although new approaches such as cross-sector coalitions and human-centered design offer innovative ways to address social issues, it is essential to recognize conflicts of interest and hold those in authority accountable for their actions.

While the world is making rapid technological and productive advancements, the majority of people do not reap the full benefits. Instead, the elite capture the majority of potential societal benefits.

From 1973 to 2014, productivity increased by approximately 70%, whereas the average worker's income rose by only 10%. The elite typically capture the majority of these gains.

The COVID-19 crisis demonstrated that even in a technocracy, marginalized and vulnerable minorities can be left behind, highlighting scenario planning's blind spots. Create a connection, a storyline that can be represented in an infographic, based on these points.

2. Important Patterns or Anomalies Discovered

C. Contextualizing Insights:

1. Interpreting Data Significance for the Topic

Introduction: A conflict between experts and citizens over the function of experts in governance characterizes the political landscape of the twenty-first century.

The Technocracy Controversy in Section

Technocracy's Proponents:

Desire effective, logical government based on evidence, facts, and logic. Decision-making should be devoid of ideological bias. Expert emblem (mortarboard hat) atop a scale

Concerns of critics: Technocratic solutions may oversimplify difficult problems. There is no singular solution to every social problem. Challenges are addressed in Section 2. Alternative economic system that promotes wealth distribution based on equality. Utilizes technology for the benefit of humanity. Breaks free from the influence of incredibly wealthy elites. Image: Diverse individuals with their hands raised

Perceived Lack of Democracy: Challenges in Contemporary Western Democracies. Citizens perceive that their needs are not being met. Power structures, corruption, and other impediments impede progress.

Development Program Restriction: Obstacles confronted by government and non-government programs.

Contains power structures, corruption, and lack of awareness. Image: Tech giants as medieval lords

Platform Monopolists: The control of platforms by tech titans.

Input from users is restricted. obstructs social progress. Social impact devoid of system change

Business Elites and Social Impact: Business elites' involvement in philanthropy and social impact.

Not likely to address the root causes of social problems. Scales illustrating the economic deficit

Economic Inequality Obstacles: the mechanisms that perpetuate economic inequality. Systemic problems and privileged understanding. Section 3: Gains Disparity

Productivity versus Income: Productivity increases between 1973 and 2014. Average worker income growth is limited. Profits captured by the privileged

The role of the elite in capturing the majority of societal benefits. The vulnerable are affected by the pandemic.

Periphery of Vulnerability: Minorities left behind by the COVID-19 pandemic.

The 21st century presents a complex governance environment in which the balance between expertise and inclusivity is essential. For the development of more equitable, effective, and receptive systems of government, it is crucial to find solutions to these obstacles. 2. Understanding Implications and Impact

IV. Design and Layout:

A. Infographic Design Concept:

- 1. Sketches or Wireframes of the Layout <u>https://www.canva.com/design/DAF2gMy5EdI/04mImxzZOrWnQaj21SV92A/edit?utm_co</u> <u>ntent=DAF2gMy5EdI&utm_campaign=designshare&utm_medium=link2&utm_source=sh</u> <u>arebutton</u>
- 2. Planned Visual Hierarchy and Flow <u>https://www.canva.com/design/DAF2gMy5EdI/04mImxzZOrWnQaj21SV92A/edit?utm_co</u> <u>ntent=DAF2gMy5EdI&utm_campaign=designshare&utm_medium=link2&utm_source=sh</u> <u>arebutton</u>

B. Color Scheme and Typography:

- 1. Selection of Colors and Their Meanings <u>https://www.canva.com/design/DAF2gMy5EdI/04mImxzZOrWnQaj21SV92A/edit?utm_co</u> <u>ntent=DAF2gMy5EdI&utm_campaign=designshare&utm_medium=link2&utm_source=sh</u> <u>arebutton</u>
- Typography Choices and Consistency Avenir and Ranille. The topic is significant yet overwhelming, reasoning behind choosing ranille is that it's bold and attention grabbing and Avenir is simple to read and not intimidating

C. Image and Icon Selection:

- 1. Relevant and High-Quality Visual Elements <u>https://www.canva.com/design/DAF2gMy5EdI/04mImxzZOrWnQaj21SV92A/edit?utm_co</u> <u>ntent=DAF2gMy5EdI&utm_campaign=designshare&utm_medium=link2&utm_source=sh</u> <u>arebutton</u>
- 2. Icons or Graphics to Enhance Understanding <u>https://www.canva.com/design/DAF2gMy5EdI/04mImxzZOrWnQaj21SV92A/edit?utm_co</u> <u>ntent=DAF2gMy5EdI&utm_campaign=designshare&utm_medium=link2&utm_source=sh</u> <u>arebutton</u>

V. Infographic Creation:

A. Design Software and Tools:

- 1. Software Used: Canva and Procreate
- 2. Any Online Resources or Templates Used: None

B. Layout and Composition:

- 1. Section Division and Placement <u>https://www.canva.com/design/DAF2gMy5EdI/04mImxzZOrWnQaj21SV92A/edit?utm_co</u> <u>ntent=DAF2gMy5EdI&utm_campaign=designshare&utm_medium=link2&utm_source=sh</u> <u>arebutton</u>
- 2. Data Integration and Visual Elements <u>https://www.canva.com/design/DAF2gMy5EdI/04mImxzZOrWnQaj21SV92A/edit?utm_co</u> <u>ntent=DAF2gMy5EdI&utm_campaign=designshare&utm_medium=link2&utm_source=sh</u> <u>arebutton</u>

C. Interaction (if applicable):

- 1. Notes on Interactive Elements: None
- 2. Justification for Use of Interaction: None

VI. Review and Feedback:

A. Peer Review:

- 1. Feedback from Classmates or Colleagues
- 2. Considerations for Improvements

B. Instructor Feedback:

- 1. Feedback Received from the Instructor
- 2. Suggestions for Enhancements

VII. Final Infographic:

A. High-Resolution Infographic:

- 1. Completed and Polished Infographic:
- 2. Exported in a suitable format (PNG, PDF, etc.) Below:



B. Reflective Statement:

- 1. Reflection on the Design Process
- 2.

The process consisted of a lot of reading. It is not only about the topic of technocracy but history of elitism, which supports this ideology as well. There are many factors that make technocracy so attractive yet harmful, including the total control given to experts and no transparency or participation in the decision process whatsoever. This factor also reflects heavily in the current stage of democracy, where those who decide what is to be done with technology and research are at the hands of a few selected representatives who may not consider public choices thoroughly while making the decisions about their allocation.

- 3. Learning Outcomes and Insights Gained:
 - 1. Technocracy is not viable for those who consider democracy in a fair light.
 - 2. Democratic representation has it's roots in technocracy.
 - 3. Technocracy may end up being to the benefit of the state but not of its people.
 - 4. An average Indian has no idea about our research and technology allocation.

5. Indians look forward to public participation when it comes to decision making surrounding research and technology.

VIII. Conclusion:

A. Summary of the Project:

- 1. Recap of Topic and Research Objectives
 - 1. To understand what technocracy is.
 - 2. How Technocracy influences democracy
 - 3. What do democratic citizens think about technocracy?
- 2. Achievement of Project Goals
 - 1. Understanding technocracy from multiple viewpoints via literature review.
 - 2. Experimenting with different visual hierarchies and elements.
 - 3. Creation of a refined infographic.

B. Key Takeaways:

- Noteworthy Insights and Data Visualization Techniques
 "There are limitations on government and non-government development programs due to power structures, corruption, and a lack of awareness, among other factors."
- Personal Reflection on the Experience: Overwhelming, Confusing and overlapping outcomes, Intese. Enlightening and provoking experience.

The documentation structure provides a systematic approach for students to research, analyze data, derive insights, and create their infographics. It ensures a well-documented process, helping students track their progress and reflect on their learning outcomes while developing an engaging and informative infographic.