

# Cybersecurity Libertarianism

Eugene Panferov

John Stossel demonstrates the following experiment.

He gathered a group of students in a circle, and dropped a lot of equinominal casino chips on the floor into the circle. He then explained the rules: initially each chip has a value \$1, this value grows in time, it doubles every minute. You can take as many chips as you can at any time. The longer you wait the more money we will give you when the game ends.

As soon as he starts the game, everybody rushes in, grabbing minimal value chips. The game ended within a couple of seconds.

For the next round he altered the rules: he divided the floor in visible sectors, each sector was assigned to a player, meaning you can only grab chips that are lying in your sector.

The game starts – everybody waits. The players invested as much time as they were given, by deferring the harvest until the end of the game.

This experiment is intended to illustrate how private property alters incentives (when these chips model crops to be grown). However, it works for any long term assignment as well (and not necessarily legal assignments, could be circumstantial too) and for any type of investment too.

A physician benefits from human illnesses, he is naturally interested in keeping illnesses alive. For him your illness is a crop to grow and harvest. He might be incentivised to invest his labour in the development of your illness so that to harvest it later with more monetary value... But a private physician can not afford such investment, because you are not permanently assigned to him – other private physicians are eager to harvest the fruits of his labour! A private physician HAS TO cure you before other doctors see the opportunity. This is the first scenario – nobody invests.

The situation is exactly opposite with the National Healthcare System – you ARE PERMANENTLY ASSIGNED TO IT. The National Healthcare System (or any other highly centralized institution) is safe to invest their labour into the development of your illnesses, because you are guaranteed to return to them – nobody else is going to steal their investment.

This has everything to do with cybersecurity.

You are permanently assigned to MS, Google, Apple, IETF, IANA, X.509, DNS, you name them...

The industry giants are incentivised to perpetuate every problem they are being paid to be solving. In cybersecurity they are incentivised TO CULTIVATE VULNERABILITY among users.

And it is crucial for the cybersecurity discourse to understand the incentives of the parties involved.

It is also the industry giants natural interest to frame the cybersecurity discourse in such a manner that you overlook the real incentives, which spell malice on the part of the discourse leaders.

Figuratively speaking, the murderer is the chief of police – this is the situation of the cybersecurity today.