



If our problem is linked with the contemporary mega-scale of *production*, *finance* and *agglomeration*—that they are simply ‘beyond big’—the problem is to determine the *scale* and *measure* to assess them. And going down that path would appear simply to be synonymous with a *pervasive* loss of control.

We must attempt to imagine, in a workable way, what can come after *hyper*-objects, -commerce and -cities (or, hyper-agglomerations). Given that we have a fair amount of knowledge of what came *before*. Under the present circumstances there is not other place to begin than starting in the middle.

So, what we can do is take one step away, to have a degree of separation: with *six degrees*—#01-#06—we have a *set* which is complete *enough* to have a *lineage*. This, and the last, flyer in the present series, will be devoted to develop an *active* approach to changing *between* positions *and* situations.



The forces that push *local* agglomeration to be *emptied* of people—alternatively, reduced to seasonal scenic spots—that we see *locally* in Norway and other places, is prompted by the *push* of centralisation of social- and health services, and the *pull* of buying up and laying down local enterprise.

Whether/not it is *intended* that the access to local natural resources becomes unobstructed in this way may *not* be essential, since it clearly follows *if* local agglomerations/habitats are emptied of people. The drift to the megapolis leaves the country *empty*, and *available* for exploitation.

The impact of mega-scale economics thereby lays the way for later—or, subsequent—*impacts*. The economics of growth has passed the threshold where growth in the *corporate* sector has *bypassed* the public sector. For some reason, we have trouble seeing this as a political *democratic* issue.

During the pandemic our domestic confinement in *working* hours, has reduced and focussed our sense of *environmental* change: we have spent more time *outdoors* and our perception of our local environment has changed and become *keener*. How to learn *from* work *and* life, then?

How often have people experienced that *sharing* experience at this level—and of this kind—has found its place as “small talk” in a time of crisis that we share? How often have they experienced that the attempts at *reporting* such observations, in an attempt to be taken seriously, are *thwarted*?

There is a line, *not* to be crossed. When it is crossed, everything one says is *wrong*, everything one does is *devious*, everything one touches becomes *contaminated*. As *though* everything we now experience is *transitory* and exceptional reflecting the *state of exception* of the crisis? But what if *not*?

What if it reflects the *shifty* play-grounds of the powers that be; *not* because they are transparent, but because they appear in a *different* way. Is it a moment where democratically minded people will have to start picking their *fights*, organising their *interests* and enter into difficult/lengthy *negotiations*?

Currently, it *doesn't* look that way: either because people, as usual, do not see what's coming before it's a fact; or, because they are *implicitly expecting* that a different approach will *emerge* that somehow will make *democracy* more *efficient* (more *involved* knowledge and involvement in *knowledge*).

Are we *almost* there? It might depend on how tight the relation is between *coded access* in business and science. Can we imagine that a change in the *scientific field* will lead to a change in *economics* (that we will see a new age of going well while doing good, overcoming present contradictions)?

How great is the change required in the university/college sector for this development to occur? Is it enough to implement the [DORA](#) declaration, for instance? Has it somehow been successful at *scripting* the source-code for an implicit *insight* in the place of knowledge in *democratic* efficiency?