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INTRODUCTION

1. What triggered the following contemplations that I am sharing publicly is my feeling that when trying to perceive a crisis intellectually being in lockdown, helps; that is, somehow you have the feeling (illusion) that you tame it, and master the time. Trying to understand the essence of things, to comprehend, to share.

Human evolution relied on human curiosity. At the same time, the coronavirus crisis changed the order of our priorities and our personal time. The result was the thoughts that I am sharing herein that were written having in my mind and in my heart, the hub of knowledge, the academic community where I belong.

This essay is intentionally to a great extent general, all around, mainly reflective and not pedantic, including a mix of assertions, predictions, proposals and thoughts.

2. It is clear that our priority today is to address this global multifaceted grave threat. But it is already time to plan tomorrow. And I do not only mean the necessary planning for addressing the crisis, that poses serious issues, such as for how long will the first phase last, in combination with the endurance of the citizens and mainly of the health system? How will gradual loosening take place and mainly when, so that to reduce the time of the second wave of the virus? Beyond those that goes without saying that the state and the government will obviously care for.

In an emergency against an unusual war that requires the militaristic wisdom, not the militaristic mentality. However, one shall already be considering what’s beyond that. The aftermath.

The Planning of tomorrow. Why the coronavirus crisis that is gripping, frightening, killing and disorganising is at the same time an opportunity. As every crisis is. To change for the better. This has been observed by Greek and foreign intellectuals\(^1\) and it therefore comes naturally to the dialectic nature of the world.

3. Of course changes - I mean changes to the better - are not inherently predetermined. And of course, the natural tendency for the world will be

\(^1\) I will not make any specific reference to any of them, because it is almost certain that I will do injustice to those I will forget, and I will overload this essay with citations, which is not the purpose here. Besides, my aim is not to make any claim to originality or awards. Therefore, I hope they will forgive me, because it is certain that among them, there are persons whose thinking has inspired me and for whom I have great appreciation.
to essentially return to normal, as it was prior to the crisis. Almost back to the same. With some limitations and within an unknown period of time. What is important however, is that the crisis is an opportunity for serious changes or, at least, corrections, because as a disrupting force it has shed light to various gaps and has highlighted various imperfections. But it will simply not take place innately. It requires a vision, planning and political will. It depends on us.

The crisis is a painful wake-up call, a warning, a Nemesis for the human irrational Hybris against ecology (a word of Greek origin, comprising of the words ‘oikos’/‘eco’ and ‘logic’); a warning that could possibly turn out to be quite beneficial. If we have the prudence to determine our future, while being at this crossroads, by changing ourselves to the better. And it is an opportunity, because global solidarity derives from the collective instinct of survival that has been activated by fear, this operative power of social organisation. It is an opportunity for a restart on many levels, if not on all of them. And it requires a vision, planning, coordination and implementation.

4. The present essay highlights this as its central message: An invitation to establish a structure, whose purpose will be to perceive, formulate, define and plan the Restart.

Because many things will change. By nature and by the force of randomness. The true dilemma is whether things will define us or we will attempt to define them. And of course this does not mean at all that even if we visualize the future, define it and plan it, things will go according to the plan. The theory of complex systems, of the black swan [Nassim Nicholas Taleb], the battle with the deterministic randomness [Prigosin, the intelligent Benoît Mandelbrot] are all very relevant today; they are the way of thinking of tomorrow and show that we will simply introduce certain factors to the chaotic expression, by assuming that in human societies we will have the capability of greater enforcement. What is certain is that we have to attempt it. And this is what I propose here. It’s an opportunity to perceive and plan a better future and correct many mistakes on a collective, national and individual level. It is an opportunity for a new synthesis, sustainable and prudent. Virus has unveiled a need
for correction\textsuperscript{2}. An opportunity for correction. And for contemplation. Because there is always a spiritual reason for what is happening in the world.

5. Political leaders - reasonably as part of their measures - are exclusively, and as a priority, dealing with the management of the crisis without planning - to the possible extent - the tomorrow. While this has to be done on all levels: global or international, European and national.

And this requires sophisticated political leaders in the philosophical sense of the word that will be culturally advanced, regardless of whether they possess the talent of political communication. Because action requires understanding and understanding requires a background of perceiving things that does not always exist.

And there is also the fear of oblivion. As is often the case. Unfortunately. The return to normal. Without learning from our mistakes.

6. Life is dialectic and comes in cycles. And after a period of plights, a period of prosperity follows. This is mainly the optimistic message. That’s the new cycle that we have to plan. Or, to put it more precisely, to attempt to plan in the midst of the ocean of randomness and the egoistic hegemonic stance of the States.

The Government, the European Commission upon mandate by the Council, the UN, the G8 & G20 shall immediately proceed to the creation of a think tank as to this issue.

\textsuperscript{2} Correction on what issues? Bill Gates in a very meaningful message, reminded us of what is important: how important our health is, the very primary possession of ours, how important solidarity is, family, that we have to be modest that a virus could kill us just like that, and disrupt the powerful global human society. And what is self-evident: that we are interconnected -linked to each other-, therefore how unbearably materialistic our society has turned out to be, and how we have underestimated the truly essential goods of health, water, environment and food; that we did not respect the environment.
And here, within our own borders, we shall immediately establish a Ministry for the Future (not as an opportunity to appoint our ‘own’ people but as a think tank consisted of the best of the technocrats), a place for socially organizing the knowledge for a better common future, a system that will not be administering powers but the vision, the public prevention of crises, a system that will not be issuing orders but proposals, that will not be using enforcement but it will be using persuasion. I will insist on this; it is crucial.

7. Today we are in the middle of the frenzy of the crisis, facing many and difficult problems and serious challenges. But we are mainly facing uncertainties, largely deriving from randomness. It is also true that we have been caught off guard. No preparation or planning. And this could be easily explained. Politics mainly serve today, the ephemeral. The lack of leadership is obvious. And the absence of leadership is also obvious. The reason is that we have leaders who have not been steeled to the plights of a war, as was the case with the previous generations of De Gaulle, Mitterrand, Schmitt, Brand, Kohl for example. The war in the broad sense of the Heraclitus war, gives rise to leaders and visions, in an effort to avoid its plights in the future.

8. Coronavirus poses difficult problems, and in order to minimize the distressing humanitarian and financial consequences thereof, we have to deal with them quickly, and under the pressure of time. Some of them are as follows:

First of all, scientific ones. Decodification of the behavior (mutation and development of the morbidity) and treatment of the virus, control of the scientific time, and time in general, mainly on a regular basis. We also currently don’t know if the virus is mutating, how quickly it does so, and what it can cause. We don’t know if and at what stage the existing medicines work. We understand that science learns fast, but it has a long way ahead. We don’t know whether the virus returns, to whom and why. We don’t know what are the fallouts for the lungs and the heart and mainly to whom and why. We don’t know if we will find a vaccine and mainly when, if this one - and to what extent - will be effective and maybe what are the risks lying with it. We don’t even know the shape of the course of the crisis, whether its shape is going to be a V or a U or a W. We are still discovering the symptoms of a virus that is easily transmitted
and is silent, because one may get infected by someone, who seems to have no symptoms.

A great scientific challenge under the pressure of time. Great uncertainties, the handling of which is not easy.

And of course, I could not resist the observation that we are expecting our rescue to come from the underrated (at least in terms of salaries, in a society, where money is a dominant principle) scientists, be it, the essence, and not from the highly-paid showbiz stars. This also, has to do with the quality of our democracy. And I will return to this issue.

**Organisational ones** – What measures? How can we accelerate the reinforcement of the public health system and for how long? How do such measures can be implemented? What production do we have or have to acquire?

And unfortunately, there are many variables to them. The first and most important is time. We don’t know when we will have the vaccine. We don’t know when we will have an effective treatment. We don’t have an abundance of tests, in order to be able to perform mass checks to the entire population.

**Political ones** – How do we plan those measures? How do we communicate them? How do we stand by the citizens? How do we handle the finances, the state of which will tremendously deteriorate? The mass psychology of despair etc.

Mainly at an international level, because the whole world is interconnected, how do you coordinate a plan, when you have states following different approaches, which entails a double risk, to recycle the virus and create a sovereign competition for tomorrow, instead of trying to fight the problem through common planning. It reveals the limits of utopian internationalism. However, this does not mean we shall not attempt to do the right thing, having technology and public pressure as our allies.

3. On the opposite side of the problems I have selectively raised, the predominant factor is time. And since scientific approach requires time, that we do not have, the strategy shall necessarily be a fast track, in order to shorten time, and experimentalism (whatever works). And among the various possible strategies described by a study conducted by Imperial that I had access to, and that did not go unquestioned, the preferred
option, I guess realistically, is a combination that is timely and mainly circular, of isolation, gradual control of the selective quarantine and spacial insulating. That is, many scientists fear that it may have many peaks. And it is certain (one of the few things that are certain) that this ‘corona-nightmare’ will only end with the vaccination of the entire population, and in the meantime, through the systematic testing of the entire population and selective isolation. When we have the means (rapid tests at home that will show if we have the virus, or when we will have developed antibodies, as well as home hospitalisation). Welcome to e-medicine.

10. The biggest problem comes from two parameters: firstly, not all countries have adopted the same measures nor at the same time, and as a result the virus may make a comeback, and secondly, we don’t know how long it is going to take until vaccination. Furthermore, we don’t know the social endurance nor the side effects of the combination of confinement, deprivation and the general feeling of impasse. Time, this is the main unknown parameter in this complicated equation.

However, this may not be disregarded, and that is why change is an absolute necessity. Our century, if we don’t change, will also be the century of viruses (as ever truly), as a global threat against humans (along with the destruction of ecosystems, the relation between demographics and food, nuclear destruction, terrorism and unfortunately war, to name the main ones), as indicated by Bill Gates in his now famous ‘ominous’ speech in TedEx. If we don’t change, maybe next time will be fatal for humanity, which at some point, despite the huge power of our intelligence, may be simply defeated. We have to change. And this means a global system of prevention of global crises and planning of their handling. A new mission has arisen as an absolute necessity. Because the crises of yesterday that were entrenched in terms of space, have now become global. And globalization of communication, technology, knowledge and economy require a balance in the globalization of solidarity. And of course this attempt shall be a collective one.

Therefore, I have put my thoughts in the order of the reasonable course of things: first is the reflection on the past and today (I), the lessons taught by the crisis shall follow (II), the future as a proposal (III) and its planning (IV).

* * *
I- REFLECTION

11. First of all, let us realise, while critically thinking as Humanity, the shallow choices for all the bad we have recklessly caused to this planet, the nature in general and to our values. Nature has its own wisdom and balance and can survive without us humans. This requires from us respect and equality. It is important to make this common understanding and impose it to the governments in order to reach a global agreement.

Modern threats are not necessarily natural phenomena (there are earthquakes of course), but the result of unreasonable human actions. The greenhouse effect and the viruses that will gradually become more resistant and will have unpleasant surprises are some typical examples thereof. We shall realise that the unity of human nature requires a unity in the global governance of these matters on global scale. And global risks require global answers.

12. There is no doubt that coronavirus is the greatest correction forced upon globalisation, much stronger than the movements of the previous decades. Exactly because it requires - at least partially and in the first place - physical isolation. The very essence of anti-globalisation. And this is unpleasant, because it’s against the social nature of humans (that is exactly the deeper meaning of imprisonment after all). Luckily, we have technology. To put it simply, it’s like time and space have frozen.

13. Financially, this will mean a brutal correction. Values will be shattered. And the mentality of pushing the impasse of the bubble to the future by transferring the liability to future generations, the mentality of leveraging of values, and our greed as a value where the concentration of values refers to, will all be punished. The economy, will oddly enough, make a major correction and a restart after detox, for a non-financial reason; be it, the coronavirus.

With the risk ranging between an inevitable limited in time repression and a permanent deep repression. Painful in the short term, but maybe beneficial in the long term. The restart will happen, and it will be the opportunity of the competent ones who have been treated unfairly by the randomness, and the opportunity of the strongest ones.

14. In terms of values, it forces us to think about the power of non-material goods, which has been described by Ordine Nuccio in an inspirational essay. It seems like the democracy of values is potentially forced upon the oligarchy of plutocracy.
But this is exactly what entails the hope for the better. We can adopt another hierarchy of values in our lives. We can discover teleworking (which financially will reduce the cost and individually will grant us more time), e-education, e-medicine, e-governance; we can put a halt at our individualistic perception that is the bearer of many plights over adopting solidarity and the conscience of being part of a collectivity. A new conscience of citizen, that of a global citizen. We shall stop harming the Nature in our daily lives, and start thinking about those living near us, give a meaning to solidarity and love for our neighbours.

*   *   *   *

11
II- LESSONS

15. What lessons lay hidden beneath this global crisis?

First Lesson. Private initiative is good but when things get difficult, we turn to the State. The private sector is the accelerator of the economic development and the public sector is the safety net of the society. The National Health System that we did not take care of but left to rot, that we did not modernise, that we did not reorganise. Always, in the organised advanced societies, public goods (health, education, justice) shall be the number one qualitative priority, at the top of which shall be health, the number one, without which all the rest do not exist. And publicly we shall all express how grateful we are for the medical and hospital staff of the country, who are, literally risking their own health, fighting on the front line of this war. The conclusion for the future shall be that everyone’s main duty shall be to affirm the excellence of public goods, health, defence, education, knowledge. They have great value and mainly importance. That does not mean accolading the disastrous statism. On the contrary. The private sector shall inoculate the public sector with good practices. That is, a balanced development between the private and the public sector (part of the profits made by the first one to maintain and modernise the second one).

Second Lesson. We owe big to knowledge. The hidden value of knowledge as power, maybe the most underrated one in the scale of values compared to the political, economic and communicational power, at the end offers solutions and is called to save the global community. We await to be saved by people earning 1800 Euros per month, while various stars - who, it is true, do generate money - are getting paid millions per year. It’s a great retaliation of the knowledge. If the society realises it, acknowledges it and invests in it, as it should be doing. But it is unknown whether it will do it and unfortunately doubtful.

Third Lesson. Humans remain vulnerable and for this reason modesty is required. A virus disrupted humanity. Even more, it threatens humanity. However, because of this global threat, we experience a unprecedented global scientific solidarity. It is true that science has been globalised since the early years. And what is more gracious than the globalisation of the noble values of solidarity even on the way to the ultimate Hubris, the deification of the human, as described by Harari in the last book of his trilogy, Homo Deus.
**Fourth Lesson.** During a crisis, you have to take all measures necessary immediately and universally. Without considering the cost. Because the pain will be less and mainly it will last for a shorter period of time. The immediate and full lockdown, the ban on all social contact for two months has been proven to be the right solution, despite the great financial cost. The leading, timely and organised political response of the Greek government, under the leadership of Professor Tsiodras, to whom the Greek society owes a lot, has been impressive.

And that until we invent either an effective anti-virus treatment or the vaccine that despite the acceleration, will also take time with equally relatively doubtful results. The epitome of fast track and physical isolation.

**Fifth Lesson.** the dangerous biological and nuclear experiments shall stop immediately, as not only they carry with them the seeds for self-destruction, but they are exactly the most repulsive form of Hubris. They shall be named by the International (Universal) Law as crimes against humanity. Because this is what they really are. And of course I am not adopting the culturally outdated conspiracy theories, but instead that of the simple human mistake.

*   *   *   *

16. Now, let’s talk about the positive aspects. *Already open to observation.*

**First positive aspect.** Firstly, the *political ones* in Greece. The very first positive aspect is that in Greece, the government listens to and bows down to science. It acts on time and mainly rationally. This is the alliance with science which has brought results and is the best one available. And it is not self-evident, if we see the choices of other countries (but also the choices we made in the past). Of course human lives are a priority over the economy or other choices.

The man is the standard for everything and the end of everything.

However, in reality this has many shades and it has been revealed by the different recipes followed by the various states. And that is, because we don’t have only one but two crises. Because after the health crisis follows the financial one. These two are in conflict. The more severe measures to be adopted during the health crisis, the more effective you will be in terms of humanitarian assistance for your citizens, but the greater will be
the financial destruction to be caused the day after. For this reason, the recipes are not the same.

It’s worth mentioning the following. The government in an appropriate and organised manner overturned the myth of the Greece's lack of organisation. And we owe this to the risk management implemented by the government. But at the same time it boosts our national confidence. And finally Greece has entered the important club of global champions showing an image of a demure (and therefore strong) and disciplined country. The amelioration of our image, the distinction of a demure Greece, a Greece of knowledge, is a very important achievement.

The motto of our era is that ‘all together, we can make it’. And I would add, we can do everything.

**Second positive aspect.** The EU (the Union) will be forced to function as a Union. At least we hope it will. Slowly, due to its usual delays, but I believe and mainly I wish it will. That is, to function collectively, as a collective subject and with solidarity. Unfortunately, it will have to. It will have to ‘get inflated’ for the future. Because, although it is a monetary Union, it will follow the state logic of last resort and a model similar to that of 1929 (although the present crisis is estimated to be financially and socially much deeper). And the ‘damned’ means, the Eurobond - the only logical development of the politically united economic Europe - is discussed today by many states, not anymore as a heretic solution condemned to burn in fire. In a way, the coronavirus logically will bend
the German prejudice (without underestimating the shortsighted obsession and roughness of Germany). ³

The positive element here paradoxically lays in a conflict. In the fundamental conflict—the reckoning-decisive for the future of the Union towards political integration or the decay of the monetary union and the free trade association.

**Third positive aspect.** The amity beyond the political controversy. The political dream of some for cooperation, for a political society, for national unity and a positive society, a rational one, a society of cons. A society of synthesis, participation etc. Credits are in order to all political forces for the meaningful and symbolic message of national unity.

And this will also be needed in the next phase; I would say in the next phase of reorganisation in particular. A collective effort is needed, that did not always exist, unfortunately, where everyone invited shall participate in. For the benefit of everyone. The crisis may and shall change the perception of the government (which mainly evolves around the prime minister) and the parties of the opposition (of the hard rock).

---

³ The fatal conflict between the catholic and protestant Europe is again inevitable. And I will explain this briefly: Every unifying attempt by nature entails a big contradiction that renders it uncertain. This is mainly because in the dialectic nature and course of things, what prevailed as a union yesterday (for example, the state over the cities) prevents the synthesis of tomorrow. Transcendence is required, which means abolition of the previous scheme (i.e. the State), which is to decide and participate in its, even partial “self-abolition” or at least to decide on the decrease of the national power over the European one. It is a great contradiction and challenge of the political integration.

However, one shall review from a moral point of view, the position of the Dutch for other reasons as well. For example, for them, Germans, Dutch etc. to create surplus, some others are guaranteeing their defence by investing 3% of their budget, I am talking about the French, the Italians, the Greeks. This typically is not taken into consideration because of the Treaties, but essentially it counts, and it counts a lot.

One could argue: well politics has nothing to do with morals. Maybe politics are actually closely associated with immorality to some extent, when it is so expedient. I was always finding this opinion superficial: the lack of a common ground of values, common political culture, disrupts popular trust and at the end democracy itself. And that is because moral values function as regulations in support of democracy and popular trust. The coronavirus problem is not a budgetary one, but much broader and much more complex, and if they do not support economies on time, then destruction and recession will last longer and will be most probably deeper than the ones we know today.

Any discussion about “terms” is at least shortsighted, and I am being very lenient on this. But because humanity has passed the age of innocence, I read it as a game of hegemony for that day, and for this reason I find it deeply immoral.

I am afraid Europe will be late in its appointment and only for a short while and with great cost. This will have as a result that the crisis of its decline will deepen, without any will to defend it, as was done in the past by the so important, very relevant today but unfairly forgotten, Raymond Aron.
Fourth positive aspect. The need (to address the crisis) will also bring many goods to the public administration, which despite its vulnerabilities, it possesses the national virtue of ‘filotimia’. That’s how we move forward, we live in an e-society. E-administration, e-health, e-work, e-proceedings etc. (some have also introduced the idea of an e-church). We will be forced to a rationalisation of the function of the public sector, and to an acceleration thereto. A fast track modernisation. And the speed and effectiveness of the government, and especially that of the minister Mr. Kiriakos Pierrakakis (and his team of course), another hero of the crisis, are impressive.

Fifth positive aspect. The prevalence in principle, of rationalism over populism. The latter exists in Greece to a large scale and takes advantage of the justified or unjustified lack of trust of the people towards the state. It is usually expressed in two stages: the accusation that the state is hiding something and the simple explanation of conspiracy.

However, it’s concerning to see the superficial imbecile reaction of disobedience of some, which has been criticised by Arkas, which basically has cultural characteristics of retardation. And here lies a misunderstanding: we are all liable. And the state (what can the state do, as is often the question) cannot be the alibi. The State is us. And those citizens showing irresponsible and antisocial behaviour show a cultural retardation. And mainly under the current situation, such behaviour may turn out to be disastrous for their fellow citizens. Italy is unfortunately a very characteristic example thereof. It’s not an excursion, nor is it a vacation; it’s a war and it requires self-consciousness and self-discipline as a responsible social behaviour. And that’s where we have a problem. And this behaviour shall be criticised by the mature fellow citizens of ours.

17. And of course, as many have noted, the traditional divide between the right and the left has lost its meaning, as it has been observed by many thinkers and leaders (I will choose to mention Andreas Drakopoulos to this regard) or at least they have to be given a new meaning (that is, the limits of the confrontation to be transferred to other issues, to the social ones). What is important is to choose the most qualified and the most capable ones, who will be determined to serve (even for a certain period of time) exclusively the public interest (either through politics or through charity, which is a very important issue for the society of today and tomorrow; because the State cannot do everything itself, the citizens shall help their fellow citizens).
Let me clarify this in one phrase to avoid any misunderstandings: before the public interest, there is no left and right. Of course, there shall be ideological fruitful opposing opinions to contribute to the enrichment and the function of democracy. But there is a great need for them to be given a new meaning. And I do not disregard the fact that the divide between left and right has an identity aspect of belonging somewhere. And that is why it is strong. It reaches out to people who have the need to follow and belong somewhere. That is, to the majority. For this reason, they shall be given a new meaning and such divide shall be the vehicle for a cultural political development around common grounds and contrasts that creatively produce a synthesis. For example, the protection of the environment has no right, conservative or left, progressive sign, same goes about the fight against statism, the safety of citizens, the re-establishment of the public sector, the reinforcement and organisation of the public goods etc.

18. Today, this is the positive thing; it seems that populism has lost. And some leaders are only voicing it, because they did not act seriously and based on knowledge, and by resorting to ‘political management’ [sic] they simply messed things up, with serious losses in human lives that maybe could have been avoided, forgetting that every human life is unique and for that reason priceless.

The slogan of a strong era shall be enlightenment, rationalism or barbarity (to paraphrase the socialisme ou barbarie).

The new divide is and maybe always has been rationalism or populism, the right thing to do or the likeable thing to do. And of course, populism has not been defeated, because it is much more pleasant and can be easily communicated. It also runs horizontally through the political systems of the western systems of democracy and is supported by the ‘media-democracy’.

**Sixth positive aspect.** Experiencing the value of collectiveness and solidarity at an individual level. The two driving forces of the human society is fear and mimicry. In the present case, fear forces us to stand together. Fear explains why we have to stand together and ontologically why we stand together, despite the individualistic human nature deriving

---

4 And to the argument of some that most of them died because of an underlying disease from which they would have died anyway - which is expressed with some immorality and great pure cynicism - the answer is that we don’t know this scientifically and mainly we don’t know when they would die. Of course, this remains to be proven in the elections of the biggest global power this coming fall.
from our self-preservation instincts. In a way, maybe humans are not social beings by nature, but deliberately.

Seventh positive aspect. We will be forced to a collective and individual restart. Let’s deal with it in an organised manner, as an opportunity. And I have observed that scientific groups are dealing with addressing the threat (and in the future there will be similar threats), but no government to the best of my knowledge has established a special think tank on the social, institutional, financial consequences and the consequences on our values for the future. There is no organised cogitation about the future. But, there should be one nonetheless. In order to define our future, we have to contemplate about it first, to conceive it intellectually.

*     *     *
III- THE FUTURE

19. The consequences may - and I put the emphasis on the possibility - vary. I shall glean, as obviously it’s not possible to cite all of them neither in full nor in an exhaustive manner.

First of all, the understanding that the state we need is not only an executive state but also a smart one. And a smart state is the one that firstly is able to define a better future for its citizens and secondly, the one that prevents and reduces the plights lying ahead. That is, the state that is flexible and knows how to handle the crises. Because crises are the rule. The society we live in is governed by the crisis as a rule; it’s the new normality. We have to study, to change, to teach another way of thinking based on crises or at least based on crisis, too.

20. Following the above, it’s an opportunity to re-appreciate public goods. To invest in them. However, free from the defects of the public sector, which condemn them to demerit. And as an expression of polity consciousness, we shall respect them. It is honorary and respectful to be a public servant. To serve the public interests. We shall attempt the big synthesis between the organisational effectiveness and the incentives of the private sector and the power and the common purpose of the public sector. An e-state friendly to the citizens.

21. Empowerment of the citizens is an important state function. It shall be perceived by everyone, culturally, for their information and mainly as a mentality, that respecting the rules, even the wrong ones, is important. The countries are made of the quality of their institutions and citizens. And in times of crisis, disciplined people will win, in the sense that they will address such crisis better and mainly faster.

22. At an individual level, it’s an opportunity to contemplate, to take up again hobbies we had abandoned, to adjust our productive model, to even do things we wanted, but we couldn’t do. Time has frozen in a way; to be exact, a part of it, is in slow motion, something that opens up space for our needs. It also entails though a qualitative element. It frees time up from the production to the benefit of our individual interests and personal development, progress and mainly self-determination. And this matters, because the time of our existence is of course limited. Because it matters how we live and mainly to what extent each one of us lives according to their wish.
It is possible that many standards will change here as well, because of the lack of social contact and e-sociability. Which will make social contact less frequent and hence more desirable. Moreover, time will again will not be in abundance, but it will be filled in a different and maybe more essential manner.

* * * * *

23. The main battle of course in the ocean of randomness is the battle against time. The new global challenge is to proactively engineer the new global risks. These risks can be rapidly spread globally. Globalization has also globalized risks. New risks, inherently linked to complex systems, are globalised. The project is to master interconnectivity. And in fact, to adapt our governance model to these new realities. We need the assistance in doing so of scientist, as Taleb or Yaneer Bar-Yam or Norman of New England Complex Systems Institute.

It is thus an essential state and international obligation to prepare the future of complex systems realities. It is a new governance fundamental quest. Failures of national and international institutions are obvious. The example of the World Health Organization is characteristic. Due to an "old" way of thinking. We need not to abolish, but to adapt. Especially our way of thinking and social modeling. We need to adapt our governance system (internal and international) to the new needs living in complex interconnected systems.

Globalisation has affected our sense of normality. In complex systems white or black swans are definitely part of the new normality.

Humanity can and will survive one or two of these crises probably. With a high cost financially and in human lives. Which would have been lesser if we had been prepared. But we have been unprepared. Most important it is doubtful if we will survive facing a series of such new threats. It is one of the most important governance's challenge. We need to put in place institutionally such mechanisms with the assistance of risk engineers.
Therefore, it seems that today, in the midst of the scientific uncertainties (effective treatment schemes, reliable tests as to antibodies, discovery of a vaccine) and the organisational uncertainties (rapid reinforcement of the public health system), the phase of containment of the spread of the virus, so that the weak public health system (and unfairly abandoned) can sustain itself, will follow a stage of supervision and gradual loosening. At least this is what we wish for, because nothing is certain, as I mentioned above. And of course, we shall be ready for the new wave, which some of the scientists say that will follow until we discover the vaccine, which after being found, again according to the scientists, will not be available before mid or late 2021 or even later (the divine randomness will decide). But I shall mention that all this is just speculation. And preparation shall take into consideration all possible scenarios.

24. Unfortunately, the price will be paid in human lives and huge financial wounds.

From a political point of view, coronavirus may, according to its handling and the consequences, determine the results of elections (especially those in the US), destabilise governments. Already certain choices (I may only suspect that of the populist, but communicationally charismatic President Trump for example, in view of the financial cost that would lead to an election cost) are driven by political criteria. Because the political cost will be the result of the financial cost. And it requires braveness to choose to put human lives above the financial wounds and the ones who did, deserve to be acknowledged. From a moral point of view, it is definitely the right decision.

25. From a financial point of view, it will force us to a restart. But it will come as an invisible fiery molten lava, as a fire. The financial consequences will be a difficult field. Many will have been destroyed. Values will have almost been lost by all. Humanity having missed a year of development and the drive from structures, will find itself in front of the riddle for a restart. In the midst of a great recession. Those economies that were dependent on the vulnerable (and fictitious) myth of leverage as a way of producing values, the first one being the over-indebted economy of the USA are facing risks, and along with them the entire global financial system as we know it today, is also at risk. It’s a network of nuclear financial bombs bearing consequences.
26. Every crisis is one of a kind and therefore there are no models. And when it is a global one, it is even more difficult to tame the torrent of randomness, and maybe impossible to do it. You definitely intervene. Empirically, inductively, deductively and under the same banner: the right thing to do is whatever works.

27. The case of our country is more difficult. With an economy bleeding because of the crisis, fragile institutions, a demographic problem, structural problems (the problem with the social insurance funds etc.) that have not been solved, still low productivity of the public sector and poor exports of products. And to a great extent with culturally uneducated citizens. All these render the leap to development difficult. Unemployment may surge. And of course indebted ‘zombi’ companies will collapse. It is like coronavirus has simply pushed down a little tile of a large domino. Unfortunately, pain is not fair. And the weaker ones will feel the pain the most.

28. However, within this picture, the money to be spent shall this time (beside the right approach of claiming money from the EU-money will be granted as there is no other recipe) be distributed rightly, based on the right criteria of national development (based on production meritocracy) and social cohesion. Rightly shall mean not by kleptocratic criteria. Rightly shall mean that those considered the most capable ones shall lead the development. And what is requested by the private sector shall be based on its operation in a time of crisis, and not be seen as an opportunity to ‘put money in the pocket’. Greece is a country that depends to a great extent on tourism and services. A sector that will be hurt and face great consequences, I hope for only one year. But a year will be enough for big rough changes. It requires social maturity, business competence and public ethos in order for the Greek restart to become in the mid-term an opportunity, despite the short-term pain that the crisis will cause. This is the third message of this essay.

29. As to the society, I randomly chose to make some references above. But also institutionally, collectively we have to organise ourselves on the basis that the State is contemplating as much as possible and prepares itself for the crises. Because what we call a crisis (the abrupt and unpredictable, random to some great extent, change beyond the normality of reality) will be the rule and the normality, as we knew it yesterday; it will be the exception. It therefore requires a smart State. The size is not important. Quality is.
30. As a last point in this essentially optimistic assessment, I will make reference to the biggest risk: if after the end of this crisis we forget. And we go back to the same old, forgetting the nightmare. While the lessons, following the end of the storm, shall be organised into a vision and political actions.

Of course, the crisis is unprecedented, and there was nothing similar to this in the past, and its consequences will be complex and it will take time until a new balance is established. It is unprecedented, because the world has never been so interconnected before, the development chain was never so solid, globalization had never gained so much space. And in turn, destabilisation. Hoops of this chain are getting lost and this of course affects the entire population (for example, consumption is reduced and so does oil).
IV- PLANNING THE FUTURE

31. Every great crisis has led to important social changes and battles. And the present crisis - both a health and a financial one - will be no exception. Jacques Attali observes in one of his recent articles that change means radically challenging the existing model of power. And in case we don’t manage to control those crises, the entire model of power, based mainly on the Rule of Law, is at risk, and along with it, the system of human rights protection, which as a value is eschatological, is at risk too. In other words, - a dilemma also posed by Hariri - the present system based on Democracy and the free market is at risk of extinction. The technological neutral - in the sense of the means that can be used both for the good and for the bad - progress also allows for the shrinking of the human freedoms (systems of totalitarian monitoring are technologically feasible) if it is deemed that within the current framework, public goods and their distribution may not be protected.

32. Therefore, the dilemmas of change break before us; not only dilemmas of values but also of originality of the mix, as the answers may be only in principle univocal. The mentality of black or white has been defeated by complexity. We are discussing on dilemmas on the basis of the various shades of grey.

33. The battle for democracy and human freedoms -
It is clear that every crisis limits the freedoms of the citizens in democracy. We already see that. Limitations on freedom and gatherings. Restoring the borders by enforcing national lockdown. But an emergency situation enforced for a while may trigger the temptation of permanence without democratic control.

The dilemma between democracy and human rights or protection of the citizens and restriction of their rights is an existing challenge and has to be answered in a regulatory complex manner and on the basis of a democracy of checks and balances. The modern governance model is based on the triptych, democracy and rule of law, human rights and free market; it will take a fight to preserve it against the risk of ‘hidden totalitarianism’. And proposals with a sense of shades. Based on proportionality. The core of justice. Being also aware that only democracy can guarantee, at least partially, that an exploitation of a crisis by oligarchy to the detriment of the whole will be avoided.

How the necessary upgrade of the State will avoid a new wave of statism? How the upgrade of the public goods will be financed by the free
market and the dynamic private initiative? How will human rights be reassured, to what extent and in which way through the restructuring of the public sector? How are we going to get the answers to these questions, and how will these matters be planned?

I hope **democracy** and its **function** will be affected for the better. The vicious cycle of communication, publicity and political rise, may crack. I hope knowledge will become the constant supporting force and through it, new models to arise that will upgrade democracy.

In other words, correcting a system where the means turned out to coincide with the message. A system of promotion of social models based on the negative and in the best case scenario on what is in fashion. And not on knowledge, validity, the positive that make a citizen better and hence free.

I know it makes sense; what is valid is not attractive, it’s not exciting. Maybe it’s also boring, and in any case not fun. The problem is how we will make attractive what is interesting and not succumb to what is easy, but void.

If democracy is not corrected, populism that leads to wrong decisions will undermine it. This has already happened.

We need to reflect further and not just condemn. Populism expresses vast popular exclusion sentiment. There are still inequalities growing, unemployment, lack of hope in many people in our societies. These people are the garden of the populism. All I want to say here is that we need to reflect other ways, correct mistakes, adopting including policies, instead of ignoring. That should be achieved by empowering all citizens (better education), increasing public trust, taking care (building a better Welfare State).

Lack of leadership derives from and leads exactly to that. We need leaders who will be convincing and will be walking on the right path. And usually, charismatic leaders, in the sense that they keenly charm the crowds are populists. While the useful, rational leaders, that is, those who take the right decisions and promote society and progress, the truly progressive leaders, almost never possess such charm and, while recognised as useful in times of crisis, they are later forgotten. It’s not common to have leaders who possess both of them.
We need to stand up and fight for our common western values: democracy, rule of law, human rights. We need cleverness, unity and adaptation defending our western (globally a minority) values patriotism.

34. The discussion on culture and a new framework of values - It is clear that everything is part of a chain. And ‘overconsumption’ contributes, for example, to environmental destruction. It is about time we discuss the model of the society and whether we will continue with the same model as a parenthesis or we will have to concentrate to what is important and become culturally simple. The culture of essence and simplicity shall be the epicentre of a political discussion that exceeds as a social model the usual and, to a great extent, obsolete division between the left and the right etc. Here, the dilemmas are addressed to an open society. The citizens will discuss which model of society they wish to live in. What goods are valuable and necessary for them, what is the value of time - being some of them. For those citizens who are autonomous to a great extent, meaning that they live the life they want.

35. The political upgrade of public goods and the value of solidarity - Let’s not repeat it. We have all realised the value of the very First Good, that of Health. There is also Education, as a means of knowledge. And if today we can hope to deal with the health crisis, then their reinforcement and detachment from a specific space (e-health, e-education) may enhance their quality and give us more time, while it may also contribute to a possibly bigger customisation of the public functions, especially in the fields of health and education. The method of practicing medicine will remain mainly in the hospitals or we will transfer the hospital’s services at home (bearing fewer risks for the citizens, lesser cost and gain in time).

Of course, we shall take into consideration mainly as to education, that school and university are also social places, where we establish bonds, communicate feelings, and therefore total isolation cannot be introduced. Hence, we have to make a synthesis, and e-education has to become more creative and enhance the quality of teaching, become interactive and shall be based more on critical review and imagination and less on memorising things, that as a stereotype is still there to resist.

Public goods also include justice. And it is certain that the new communication technologies and e-justice may contribute to decongestion, amelioration of the effectiveness and at the end, of the quality of its function. We are still a step back.
It would be unfair not to make reference to the positive spontaneous function of the Mass Media, in their majority, and that of the journalists, which show something good, even when being over the top. Their contribution to the common educational and collective effort.

36. The financial restart - There is no doubt that the crisis will seriously affect the financial sector. The coronavirus crisis is also a financial crisis. And the solutions to be chosen in principle by printing fresh money, increasing the global debt and inflation, will have as a purpose the restart of the economy. The question is, where will all this money go and what will be the logic to be followed as a main choice. Will it be in investments in facilities, services or public goods (health and education, research and primary sector)? What will their form be? ‘Lending’, Nationalisations? And at a national level, are we going to invest in knowledge and our exceptional by and large scientists? Are we going to limit the dominant policy of benefits, which is pleasant in terms of politics, but productively sterile, only to those who fairly have to be assisted in the framework of the imposed solidarity, an obligation of the whole and the state? Is it possible to adopt a policy that would be based on development through investments in public goods and an even cooperation between the public and the private sector? The problem is that the private sector and initiative can better guarantee the development, and the public sector and public goods have a principal social role. How could one combine these two? And through financial policies that combine the protection of public goods, and mainly that of the environment.
For Greece in particular, this will be a great new opportunity. There will be a financial boost (the means is no relevant at this moment, but what is top priority is for the financial system to remain standing, nor is it relevant how, through long-term loans with low or no interest rate, perpetual bonds etc.). What is important is that this is a new opportunity and indeed one of the greatest ones for the repositioning of the country in the global production sector. If we follow a blinkery benefit policy, which is mainly politically convenient, then the game is over. As was Marsall over to a great extent. Because of the games of shrewd politicians and the oligarchy of that time. This money (20-30 billions to be injected, as per my estimations) shall be Greece’s bet for the future. To be spent on a tripartite axis: 1/3 to be provided as aid to those in need, which is an obligation of the state and social coherence, 1/3 to be provided for the modernisation of the public authorities (health, research, education) and 1/3 to be provided for the creation of a new production model for Greece (that is, what will Greece contribute to the global party that will bring in income for development). And of course, we will have to count on our magical country as a place of residence, as a Florida as well as on our primary sector and our shipping industry, mainly investing on quality instead of quantity, but at the same time we can provide aid to the technologies of the future (in the same way Israel successfully did) or defence (as Turkey did). That is, counting not on the occasional population but permanent residents, especially now that tourism will go through a grave crisis. It is important to produce a production plan both for the public and the private sectors. And such plan to form the pilot for a new Greece. And such plan will be the navigator for a new Greece. And this way we will honour 2021 better and mainly more essentially.

We may also be in front of bombshell changes such as the repeal of banknotes and coins and the exclusive use of electronic payments (where various problems arise, such as citizens who don’t know or cannot run their lives through electronic means or the security systems that would accompany such a measure). How will such changes be prepared, how will they be planned?

Environmental protection, shielding against public health risks (in a century that will be the century of viruses being the global threat, as has
been rightly pointed out recently by Professor Elias Mosialos) shall be the
goal and the filters of our new production model.

Are the new sectors that might emerge in the financial field, those of
humanism and solidarity? That is, health, environment, circular economy,
education and knowledge, cultivation and food, water and the financial
services and, of course, energy?

Will the consumption frenzy be mitigated (purchase of useless goods,
purchase just to purchase) and will our lives become more spiritual,
solidary, simple and maybe more essential? Will this also trigger a change
in our values (that is, what will have value in our society and what value
shall mean in the future)?

This transition –in the optimistic scenario- is a complex global process
and requires a common strategy (because of the invincible
interdependence of ours) and a normality plan.

Maybe it’s just utopic, but is it worth-attempting? Because human history
teaches us that it moved on with yesterday’s utopia, which turned out to
be tomorrow’s reality.

Will this humanism, the upgrade of public goods and a governance also
based on crises be placed at the center of the political power?

37. What will be the future of globalization? Globalization will not be
brought to a halt, but in my opinion it will be corrected. I believe that the
abolition of borders and walls, that is, the expansion of freedom is one of
the greatest achievements of humans. However, globalization does not
only mean growth of markets, excessive consumption and mainly
financial deregulation, but new global balanced regulations shall be
formulated as to the global public goods (environment, health). WHO has
been stumped. The UN has been inexistent. G7 & G20 have been absent
even at a coordination level. But along with a new Bretton Woods and a
new institutional change, we need a balanced reinforcement of the States.
In short, a re-organisation of the global leadership and authorisation, and
reinforcement of the collectivities of globalization. A new synthesis shall
be invented between liberalism and the need for regulatory protection.
And in this, priority shall be given to public goods and the protection of
those in need globally. The economy shall become circular, no action that
could harm the environment shall be allowed and gradually first through
counter incentives and then through sanctions (for example, boycottage)
to impose it as a global model, in order to stop environmental destruction.
And at the same time to build everywhere (including at a corporate level) a valuable eco-conscience, which has already begun today.

38. And peace shall be imposed. It sounds utopic. And largely it is. But it is essential. Humanity as a subject has many ‘wars’ to fight ahead of it, apart from the viruses: that of demographics and hunger, that of energy, sustainable development, poverty, education, terrorism. Ethnic and religious wars shall be denounced as wars that divide humanity, which could possibly concern everyone globally. It’s like the fly of a butterfly here. Humanity has to fight human evolution.

Those global issues of enforcement also include respect of the environment. And the preventive measures for global health. With a new field of international law to be supported by a globalized governance and sanction system.

Among the fundamental problems will also be the re-drawing of borders. The current irregular mass relocation of people renders it necessary to find a plan for a global regionally distributed model of borders. Without limiting freedom of movement. The abolition of walls is the conquest of the global civilisation and we shall not return to a close model.

*   *   *

39. Today we shall replace the hegemony model and under the pressure of unity of human nature and our humanitarian international principles, move from the state competition to an organised collective cordial accord. The balances have already changed. The crisis of the USA and the Western civilisation, the identity and institutional stagnation of the Union, even worse its emaciation, the rise of China and the regional hegemony of Russia, are all elements of the new geopolitical environment, as everyone can observe. The traditional ideological axes have retreated. The axis of West and East sounds very simple today. As does the axis of North and South. On the contrary, the cultural axis (where I shall also include religion) is maybe more prevalent. Power is fragmented. The USA is globally financially dominant because of the dollar (although they fall sort in terms of production), while they now share, for example, military dominance. A crisis between West and China is already perceivable and will probably escalate once the health crisis is over. Probably in the economical field. The crisis has turned West to be extremely suspicious regarding China and World Health Organization. Attention should be drawn also to Turkey, of different weight of course, of twilight Erdogan regarding emigration pressure to Europe and Greece.
Within this changing environment, we have to think about international cooperation and understanding. There is no need for the consequences of a global war to exist, for this to happen. The coronavirus crisis serves as a warning.

40. The need for a new global governance model. Globalization requires international institutions that will be expressing collective needs. Every time needs its institutions and globalization needs its own institutions. It seems that we are heading towards a ‘Publica Globalocal’.

It is evident that in front of the contemporary threats, that have been upgraded to global threats through the globalization, the existing governance institutions don’t work neither in a satisfactory nor in a timely manner. This in part may be explained by the fact that they were created in the era of internationalism after the Second World War. Today they fail to correspond to the current conditions and their complexity.

We saw how late was WHO to respond, how very little importance it has, while it should be leading, coordinating, preventing. The UN is sluggish.

It is clear that today the game is determined by the States based unfortunately on their ‘egoistic’ hegemonic interests. We have globalization in the private sector, globalization as to the threats, but state reaction. I don’t know if the nature of things is this, but logically, the global system is in need of coordination at a global scale. And it is also evident that the current model is not corresponding to the needs. If things do not move ahead based on logic, I am afraid that need will make them move. This is also related to globalization as a contemporary social phenomenon. What will its fate be? Will the coronavirus crisis, that de facto creates borders and limits, brings it at a halt, will it be corrected or return to its prior to the crisis momentum?

41. European Union or European Dissolution? Of course this consideration concerns the European Union. Where national egocentrism of the most powerful nations is equally prevalent, mainly that of Germany, over the Union collective solidarity conscience. And action.

There is an explanation for this union incompetence. That’s mainly because of the political proximity. You are not elected because you are a good European. At a political level, national states prevail. Europe seems further away than the national states, for its citizens. But it is a fact that we need Europe, because without it we are insignificant in the international chessboard. These are all cliches that it’s worth mentioning in this time of crisis. The crisis revealed all the pathogeneses of the European Union. And the need to change. Both in terms of philosophy
and in terms of governance model and the function of the institutions. The crisis took us off guard and no solidarity was expressed (it is characteristic that Italy is being assisted by China and Cuba, while Spain is struggling without any help; that’s a shame for Europe).

Will Europe decide to change? Will it do something more in the governance of solidarity other than being a global payer instead of finally becoming a global player? Even on this: will German hegemonic ‘blindness’ be bent and will we move ahead with the issuance of a Eurobond, as many have been suggesting since 2010. But back then it got stuck on the grounds of moral hazard, that is, to not favor those responsible for the crisis. Today however, this justification does not stand. No one is responsible for the coronavirus crisis. However, the same protestant obsolete and short-sighted logic of conditionality continues until today, in a period of such a crisis. The masks have fallen. And certain states never understood that their prosperity has to a certain extent be shared.

European Union is at peril. Jacques Delors has stated it in clear terms: who wants that Europe.
The crisis shall not downgrade the European Union into a miserable monetary incomplete Union. Today it is at risk more than it was at any other time. And it deserves better. And it is necessary for all the European citizens. But Europe should change and become socially more coherent and less State selfish. In other words, Europe should transform into a Union and stop being simply a Sum of States.

42. The Smart State - There is no doubt that on the level of the national State, many changes shall take place. A flexible state for the timely prevention and management of crises that will be a daily event, an e-state to the service of its citizens, political consultation and creative opposition. And many more. It is, however, an opportunity for a big organised change. Something will remain from this war, as is usually the case. What kind of State do we want? How will this state be able to deal with the collective threats of the future, the new challenges? Is management enough?

*   *   *

---

5 A paradox is Europe has negate wrongly to Greece a "Marshall plan" which today is needed for the Union.
CONCLUSION

Hence, I will conclude these thoughts, in brief and of course not exhaustively, being the result of an attempt to think about the crisis and trigger a discussion, a contemplation and ultimately some action.

43. The addendum of the contemplation is known: System of values, global, european, national system, economy and public goods. The issue is in their content. And the stake of tomorrow. To conclude with, on an individual level I believe that a new culture of simplicity, a collective humanism based on the conscience of supremacy of public goods and their strengthening, could all prevail. By leaving vanity aside. It’s not easy. But let us think of a new hierarchy of values, what really matters for us, what is essential. This re-evaluation can be done and through this other way, as a common conscience and preference of values, we will force the leaders to also change. Yes, citizens are weak. But not so weak, if they want to. And of course, we have to realise that on an individual level and on a collective level, we have to leave our comfort zone. Leaving our comfort zone is a necessity for the change and hope for a better future.

There is also a historical cyclical threat: history taught that often, after that kind of crisis, important conflicts are raised, wars, as a condition to change (πόλεμος in accordance to Héraclites). And the tension among the U.S. of Trump and China is already perceivable. Global leadership needs to handle future time with prudence, despite some justified or unjustified complaints.

*   *   *

44. For closing, an applause to the doctors and the medical staff who are fighting with self-denial, honouring the Hippocratic oath they sworn to. But the applause is not enough. Some sort of public acknowledgement and honour shall follow tomorrow by enhancing the conditions of their work. The society shall treat them fairly. And shall honour those unsung heroes. Actively, materially and morally. Let’s think about the injustice of the entertainment world (that promotes the various ‘tv stars’ by and large void of anything substantial (-excluding the journalists from this comment) over the society of substance (of knowledge and solidarity of those who with great effort and consistency are offering public goods to others). Their acknowledgement and upgrading is mandatory for a moral and fair society, which does not simply applaud in sympathy when in need, but offers its actual acknowledgment later on.
Planning of the future, an opportunity for a productive evolution for Greece and personal reflection on values, are the three messages of this essay. The great threat: oblivion and blind return to our comfort zone. It is more probable that we will return back to the strong old model with minor changes. And that perspective, a missing chance for correcting the old model in many respects will vanish by the force of the old model and the existing balance of social powers. That is another reason of sharing these thoughts, in order to contribute not to lose the chance of the crisis. Here comes a challenge for future leadership!

Haris Pamboukis
POSTSCRIPT IN BRIEF

In Spain the problems have already started and the government got fooled because of the lack of credibility of the test. It will fall. In Italy Salvini will be elected. Bad news for Europe. At least for that Europe. In the US it’s too soon to tell, but Trump most probably will have a problem facing Biden's wisdom. Under his presidency the US were made shrank down. They addressed the issue worse than others and the coronavirus did not manage to wake up Trump or the big giant. But everyone can see all these. Instead of globalisation, decrease of the international and the cooperation and at the same time strengthening of the States and their national egoistic reactions. Instead of decreasing competition ontologically, competition will increase. Instead of increasing solidarity appropriately, solidarity will decrease.

Money will be injected, I don’t see a problem there. How will they be distributed and what will be the burden for the next generations? That’s where the problem lies. As to the new generations that we are treating them unfairly and we are continuously creating an even more difficult starting point for them. Although at a small scale, many businesses will close. Of course, there is going to be a financial rearrangement. Some will get out as winners and some as losers. And great unemployment. Benefits is a shallow model that will act as an aspirin, but it is not able to address the inevitable reshuffle. This field will determine the fate of governments at a political level: what, where, how much, whom and when they will assist financially. And mainly political choices. The financial sector will be crucial, because when the fear of the citizens about their health disappears, the whole situation will be forgotten and what is going to be important will be their livelihood, which is certainly going to be materially worse.

We will live less openly, less freely, with a health passport and possibly with less money, if the crisis lasts for more than three months, which is the most prevalent scenario today. In general, the West will most probably get out of this with losses. However, as long as we have the dollar, the US is very difficult to lose their dominance. And the development will be e- and public (and charity in the broad sense of the word). An economic policy of benefits, where the crucial question is how development will arise through the private sector. A very crucial matter. An economic policy of benefits may not last in time and is a guarantee for stagflation. Moves backwards to development. Of course there will be changes as to the emotional depth of the people; different type of sociability, less emotions etc. Finally, we are moving towards an organised society of controlled people, where the issue will be the balance between freedoms and public protection. Most probably a much worse world is lying ahead of us, if we don’t do anything and the circumstances do not assist in competent leaders coming to prominence. And this because of the short-sighted approach of the leaders who did not include in their "political priorities” the clear scientific warnings.