

The Centralization of Power: A Threat to Local Democracy

Many countries, including India, were originally envisioned as decentralized democracies—where local governance through institutions like sarpanches and district courts empowered communities. Over time, however, this vision has eroded. The power of the people has gradually been stripped away, while political authority has become increasingly concentrated in the hands of a few.

The Shivarthu Protocol seeks to restore this lost balance by ensuring that power remains with local leaders and citizens, rather than distant centralized authorities.

Shivarthu: The Rise of Specialization-Based Decentralized Democracy

In a world increasingly driven by complexity and expertise, a new form of governance began to emerge—**specialization-based decentralized democracy**. Unlike traditional systems that expected a farmer to vote on nuclear policy or a programmer to decide agricultural subsidies, this model empowered

individuals through their fields of knowledge and lived experience.

Take the **Biologist Circle** as an example.

Here, everyone connected to the life sciences—doctors, biology students, lab researchers, field ecologists, and even citizen scientists—could voluntarily form a **specialized group**. These groups could be local, regional, or global, shaped by interest or geography. What bound them wasn't location or party lines, but purpose and expertise.

From within the group, members used **approval or score voting** to elect a council of **1,000 to 5,000 representatives**. These representatives weren't politicians, but respected contributors—people with both reputation and responsibility.

Once elected, the representatives didn't just receive authority—they received **trust**. Through a broader mechanism of **conviction voting**, the larger democratic ecosystem allocated **bulk funding** to each specialized group. This method allowed citizens across domains to signal their belief in the group's importance and urgency, with deeper conviction translating into longer-term funding locks. *Conviction Voting*: voters lock tokens over time → gain more voting power.

With resources in hand, the biologist representatives didn't hoard power—they **distributed it**. They designed bounties—targeted micro-grants and mission-driven projects—addressing everything from local water quality testing to cutting-edge gene therapy research. Some focused on urgent social health issues, such as reducing anemia in women, combating child malnutrition, or improving the infrastructure of under-resourced hospitals. Each bounty was a call to action, inviting experts and innovators to solve real problems with real impact—driven not by bureaucracy, but by purpose and expertise. These were opened to the community, encouraging contributions and innovations from all corners of the group.

No central ministry decided how to spend resources for biology across an entire nation. Instead, **those who lived and breathed the discipline guided its direction**, adapting quickly to new knowledge, local challenges, and community needs.

Other domains—engineers, educators, artists, environmentalists—followed suit, forming their own **autonomous knowledge democracies**.

Together, they wove a world where **governance scaled with wisdom**, and **funding followed trust**. Where expertise didn't isolate, but empowered. And

where democracy wasn't diluted by ignorance, but sharpened by insight.

It was the beginning of a new era: not just of rule by the people, but rule **by the informed people**—a society governed not by popularity, but by **purpose**.