

# When is Decentralization Not a Good Thing?



# It is decentralized when

1. Not everything is decided at the same place
2. Nor is too much decided at any place

But decentralization is a process, not a fixed state

To bootstrap or fork a decentralized network, centralization is required to achieve critical mass

To maintain economic equilibrium, networks oscillate between the topologies as they evolve or they die

Always a mix of both

One in the other

A movement... A spectrum

When we *think* a decision is highly imp and requires competence, we tend to invite centralization as we defer to the experts

Your decentralization  
is not  
my decentralization

So is the answer in:  
Meritocracy?

# The problems of meritocracy

1. Who decides how to decide who is competent?
2. The already powerful decide the rules for re-distributing that power
3. Leads to concentration of power due to a selection bias



# Making meritocracy great again

Between all those who are making the decision and those affected by it:

1. More proofs, less trust
2. Enforcing accountability, beyond just transparency
3. Skin in the game so no one enjoys outsider play

Decentralization is  
not a good idea  
when not everyone has the  
competence to verify  
the proof of competence

Decentralization is  
not a good idea  
when not all stakes are  
measurable or even  
quantifiable

Decentralization is  
not a good idea  
when its accountability is  
defined only by the powerful

If the powerful decide  
how to not have power,  
how to re-distribute power,  
it will always lead to  
new forms of power

Upon a successful revolution,  
the left, by taking power,  
becomes the new right

---

Revolutions à la Decentralization  
can never stop

# Thank you



- Q & A -