



Research paper

The Rise of Leaderless Systems: Decentralization in the Digital Age

Fred Siambe Omweri ^{*1}, Orisiima Milton Kahindi ², Brian Besigye ², Mugumya Yoweri ²

¹ Lecturer, Department of Social Sciences, Machakos University, Kenya

² Department of Public Administration and Management, Kampala International University, Uganda

KEYWORDS

decentralization
leaderless systems
algorithmic governance
peer validation
digital activism
distributed decision-making
ethical frameworks

ABSTRACT

Contemporary governance faces a crisis of legitimacy as centralized leadership struggles to meet the demands of digital coordination and participatory agency. This study investigates the rise of leaderless systems, examining how decentralized networks coordinate action, distribute authority, and challenge traditional models of control. Drawing on historical antecedents such as Montesquieu's separation of powers, Tocqueville's civic decentralization, and the Zapatista movement, alongside case studies including Bitcoin, Wikipedia, Occupy Wall Street, and Kenya's Gen Z protests, the research explores how algorithmic consensus, peer validation, and cryptographic trust enable collective action without centralized leadership. A typology of leaderless systems is developed to assess operational logic across blockchain governance, open-source collaboration, and digital activism. Ethical and philosophical dimensions are considered, with attention to legitimacy, accountability, and trust in algorithmic environments. The study demonstrates that while leaderless systems offer democratizing potential and resilience, they also risk fragmentation and exclusion, and proposes a conceptual framework to guide their evaluation in the digital era.

1. Introduction

Decentralization is conventionally understood as the redistribution of authority from central institutions to peripheral actors (Bahl & Bird, 2018; Boko, 2002; Faguet, 2023; Rondinelli, 1981; Torrissi, Pike, & Tomaney, 2013; Allain-Dupré, 2020). It remains a cornerstone of political, economic, and organizational reform discourse, spanning a continuum of structural transformations designed to enhance autonomy, responsiveness, and equity within governance architectures (Rahman, 2023). These reforms are frequently justified by their capacity to strengthen public accountability, stimulate political competition, and impose incentive-compatible constraints on centralized power (Omweri, 2024a, Faguet, 2013; Mbate, 2017; Smith & Revell, 2016; Smoke & White, 2005; World Bank, 2011; Yilmaz, 2009).

Building on its foundational definition, decentralization in political domains manifests through a spectrum of frameworks that redistribute decision-making authority from national governments to subnational entities. Core modalities—federalism, devolution, and subsidiarity—offer distinct mechanisms for tailoring governance to localized needs (Smoke, 2015; Treisman, 2007). Federalism formalizes the division of powers between central and regional units, enabling legislative and administrative functions to reflect sociocultural diversity and



*Corresponding author: Fred Siambe Omweri

DOI [105281/ijisr-2370126](https://doi.org/10.2478/2370126)



regional priorities (Watts, 2008). Devolution deepens this reallocation by transferring administrative and fiscal responsibilities to local governments, thereby enhancing service delivery and fostering community stewardship (Falleti, 2005). Subsidiarity reinforces these approaches by advocating that decisions be made at the most immediate level capable of addressing them effectively, promoting responsiveness and democratic accountability (Biondi, Eeckhout, & Ripley, 2012).

Complementary frameworks further diversify the architecture of decentralization. Delegation entails central authorities entrusting specific functions to semi-autonomous agencies or regional bodies without full power transfer (Rondinelli, 1981; Litvack, Ahmad, & Bird, 1998). Localism foregrounds community-level governance and the primacy of local identity in shaping policy (Pratchett, 2004), while regional autonomy grants distinct territories legislative and administrative independence within unitary or federal systems (Keating, 1998; Hooghe, Marks, & Schakel, 2010). Contemporary modalities extend the foundational principles of decentralization by introducing adaptive and context-sensitive innovations. Networked governance facilitates horizontal coordination among public, private, and civil society actors through collaborative platforms (Sørensen & Torfing, 2007; Rhodes, 1997), while multilevel governance—particularly evident in supranational contexts such as the European Union—illustrates how authority is distributed across overlapping jurisdictions (Piattoni, 2010). Innovations like participatory budgeting institutionalize citizen engagement in public expenditure decisions, fostering transparency, civic empowerment, and institutional trust (Wampler & Hartz-Karp, 2012). Collectively, these modalities recalibrate decentralization to align with specific political, administrative, and sociocultural imperatives. They enhance governance effectiveness while deepening democratic legitimacy, offering a dynamic repertoire for responsive and inclusive statecraft.

To operationalize these principles, decentralization functions across geographic and administrative scales through the strategic reallocation of authority. Empirical illustrations underscore this logic. In Kenya, Huduma Centres exemplify territorial decentralization by consolidating public services at the county level, enhancing accessibility and administrative responsiveness (Nkanata, 2024). Blockchain-based land registries, piloted in East Africa, demonstrate institutional decentralization through tamper-proof, transparent property records that reduce corruption and strengthen tenure security (von Wangenheim, 2020; Sahoo et al., 2023). Participatory budgeting initiatives, increasingly adopted by municipalities, institutionalize citizen engagement in fiscal decision-making, reinforcing democratic accountability and local agency (Wampler, McNulty, & Touchton, 2021; Gherghina, Tap, & Soare, 2023). These cases illustrate how decentralization adapts to sociocultural and technological contexts, translating normative principles into tangible governance innovations. At the territorial level, regions, counties, and municipalities acquire jurisdictional autonomy aligned with local needs and cultural contexts (Roy, 2022; Wunsch, 2001). Spatial differentiation enables governance to respond to demographic, ecological, and economic variation (Conyers, 2007). Within institutional hierarchies, decentralization restructures vertical power relations. Decision-making, resource control, and implementation responsibilities shift from central agencies to intermediary and local institutions (Crook & Manor, 1998). This configuration supports multi-level governance, where national, regional, and local actors interact through nested mandates and coordinated frameworks (Hooghe & Marks, 2003). The result is a polycentric system in which authority is distributed across governance nodes, enhancing responsiveness, accountability, and institutional coherence (Andersson & Ostrom, 2008; Mwenda, 2010).

In the digital age, decentralization evolves into a networked paradigm that transcends traditional territorial and institutional boundaries. Authority is embedded in algorithms, protocols, and peer-to-peer architectures rather than formal institutions. Technologies such as blockchain, smart contracts, and decentralized autonomous organizations (DAOs) enable governance without centralized oversight (Balcerzak et al., 2022; Cardoso, 2023). Hierarchical control is replaced with programmable consensus and cryptographic trust, allowing translocal communities to coordinate, transact, and make decisions across borders in real time. This transformation reconfigures power both spatially and structurally, reshaping governance into a fluid, participatory, and technologically mediated ecosystem (Esposito et al., 2025).

While both networked governance and leaderless systems decentralize authority, they diverge fundamentally in structure and logic. Networked governance retains institutional actors—government agencies, civil society organizations, and private firms—who collaborate through horizontal coordination and negotiated platforms (Sørensen & Torfing, 2007; Rhodes, 1997). Authority is distributed, but still anchored in formal mandates, legal frameworks, and bureaucratic oversight. In contrast, leaderless systems dissolve institutional hierarchies altogether. They operate through algorithmic consensus, peer-to-peer protocols, and cryptographic trust, embedding governance in infrastructure rather than institutions (Hassan & Filippi, 2021; Buterin, 2020). Whereas networked governance facilitates inter-organizational cooperation, leaderless systems instantiate post-organizational coordination, where decision-making emerges from autonomous agents interacting within rule-based digital architectures. This marks a paradigmatic shift—from negotiated authority to protocolized agency.

Building upon digital decentralization, leaderless systems represent a paradigmatic shift in governance logic. Unlike traditional digital platforms such as Facebook or Google—where authority is centralized in corporate hierarchies and algorithmic opacity—leaderless systems operate without institutional command. They rely on distributed consensus, algorithmic coordination, and collective agency. Enabled by peer-to-peer technologies and decentralized protocols, these systems embed decision-making in transparent, self-executing mechanisms governed by programmable rules and reputational incentives (Buterin, 2020; Hassan & Filippi, 2021; Esposito et al., 2025). Authority is diffused across autonomous actors through cryptographic trust and shared norms, redefining legitimacy through infrastructure rather than leadership. This model fosters governance that is adaptive, resilient, and intrinsically democratic—anchored in protocol-centric architectures rather than platform-centric control.

Against this backdrop, the present study interrogates how digital networks facilitate coordination in the absence of centralized leadership. It examines the architecture and operational logic of leaderless systems, tracing the mechanisms that sustain distributed agency and the socio-political dynamics they engender. These systems represent not merely a structural adjustment within existing institutions, but a fundamental redefinition of authority in digitally networked environments. To structure this inquiry, the study delineates three archetypes of leaderless systems—protocol-governed networks, community-moderated platforms, and hybrid configurations. These models provide a conceptual scaffold for analyzing how leaderless systems operate, adapt, and interface with broader socio-political ecosystems.

2. Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative, interdisciplinary research design to explore the emergence and operational logic of leaderless systems in the digital age. It integrates theoretical analysis, case study examination, and interpretive synthesis to interrogate how decentralized networks function without centralized authority.

2.1 Research Design

The research is structured around a multi-method qualitative approach, combining:

- **Documentary analysis** of scholarly literature on decentralization, digital governance, and social movements.
- **Case study methodology** to examine empirical instances of leaderless systems, including Bitcoin, Wikipedia, DAOs, Occupy Wall Street, the Arab Spring, and Kenya's Gen Z protests.
- **Thematic synthesis** to identify recurring patterns, operational mechanisms, and ethical implications across diverse contexts.

This design enables a nuanced understanding of both the structural anatomy and philosophical foundations of leaderless systems.

2.2 Data Sources

Primary data were drawn from:

- Peer-reviewed journal articles, books, and institutional reports on decentralization, algorithmic governance, and digital activism.
- Publicly available documentation and technical whitepapers related to blockchain protocols, smart contracts, and decentralized autonomous organizations.
- Media reports, protest documentation, and social media artifacts from movements such as Occupy Wall Street and Kenya's Gen Z protests.

Secondary sources included theoretical contributions from political philosophy, organizational studies, and cybernetics.

2.3 Analytical Framework

The study employs a grounded theory-inspired coding strategy to extract themes from textual data. Drawing on Kuckartz (2019) and Moore (2018), qualitative text analysis was used to identify key dimensions of leaderlessness, including distributed decision-making, peer validation, and algorithmic governance. These dimensions were then mapped onto a typology of leaderless systems to assess their operational efficacy and ethical contours.

2.4 Case Selection Criteria

Cases were selected based on:

- Their explicit rejection of centralized leadership structures.
- Their reliance on digital or decentralized coordination mechanisms.
- Their relevance to governance, activism, or organizational design.

This purposive sampling strategy ensured conceptual diversity and empirical richness across geographic and technological domains.

2.5 Limitations

While the study offers a robust conceptual and empirical foundation, it is limited by its reliance on secondary data and publicly available documentation. Future research could benefit from ethnographic fieldwork, interviews with participants in decentralized systems, and longitudinal analysis of governance outcomes.

3. Historical Context of Decentralization

3.1 History of Decentralization in Governance

Decentralization in governance traces its intellectual lineage to classical political thought, where philosophers such as Montesquieu and Tocqueville championed the dispersion of power as a safeguard against tyranny. Their advocacy transcended administrative design; it was rooted in a normative vision of liberty, civic virtue, and pluralism (Rahe, 2009; Arban, Martinico, & Palermo, 2021).

Montesquieu's *The Spirit of the Laws* (1748) introduced the doctrine of separation of powers—dividing authority among the executive, legislative, and judiciary to prevent its concentration. Yet his contribution to decentralization extended beyond institutional architecture. He emphasized the role of *corps intermédiaires*—intermediate bodies such as guilds, local aristocracies, and provincial institutions—as buffers between the central state and individual citizens. These entities, he argued, preserved liberty by diluting centralized authority and fostering pluralism (Montesquieu, 1748/1989; Shackleton, 1961). His vision influenced both monarchic and republican constitutional arrangements, laying the groundwork for federalist principles and subsidiarity in modern governance (Bednar, 2008; Benz & Broschek, 2013).

Nearly a century later, Tocqueville extended Montesquieu's pluralist liberalism into the democratic age. In *Democracy in America* (1835–1840), he observed that the vitality of American democracy stemmed from its robust local institutions—townships, municipalities, and voluntary associations—that enabled direct citizen participation. Tocqueville warned that unchecked democratic equality could devolve into “soft despotism,” where individuals retreat into private life and relinquish autonomy for comfort (Tocqueville, 1835/2000; Rahe, 2009). For him, decentralized governance was not merely technical—it was cultural. It cultivated responsibility, sustained civic engagement, and acted as a bulwark against authoritarian drift (Dahl, 1998; Warren, 2001).

Together, Montesquieu and Tocqueville offer a conceptual lineage that frames decentralization as both a structural necessity and a normative imperative. Their insights underscore the importance of multiple centers of authority—not only to prevent domination but to nurture active citizenship. Contemporary models such as federalism, devolution, and participatory budgeting echo these classical foundations, reaffirming their relevance in modern administrative reform (Fung, 2006; Shah, 2006).

In the postcolonial era, many newly independent states—particularly in Africa and Asia—experimented with decentralization to promote local autonomy and improve service delivery. The global wave of the 1980s and 1990s, driven by structural adjustment programs and democratization efforts, further institutionalized decentralization. International actors such as the World Bank championed it as a tool for good governance, emphasizing transparency, accountability, and citizen participation (World Bank, 1997; Wunsch & Olowu, 2000). Today, decentralization is increasingly viewed not just as administrative reform but as a pathway to inclusive development and responsive governance (Smoke, 2015; Rugeiyamu & Msendo, 2025).

3.2 Case Studies of Decentralization: Africa and Asia

3.2.1 Kenya – Devolution for Equity and Inclusion

Kenya's 2010 Constitution institutionalized devolution by creating 47 county governments with elected governors and assemblies. This shift toward devolved governance aligns with Omweri's (2024a) analysis of constitutional decentralization, which emphasizes federalism's role in enhancing regional autonomy and democratic accountability. This reform aimed to address historical marginalization, especially in northern and

coastal regions. Counties now manage substantial budgets and have autonomy over health, infrastructure, and local development. While service delivery has improved in many areas, challenges remain in fiscal accountability and capacity gaps (Nyanjom, 2011; Wanyande, Kibara, & Kosure, 2021; Lelegwe, 2022).

3.2.2 Tanzania – Decentralization by Devolution (D-by-D)

Tanzania adopted D-by-D in the 1990s, transferring administrative and fiscal responsibilities to local government authorities. The reform improved local planning and service delivery, particularly in education and water sectors. However, limited autonomy and overdependence on central transfers have constrained full realization of decentralization goals (Madaha, 2022; Commonwealth Secretariat, 2010; IRC & WaterAid, 2005).

3.2.3 Rwanda – Performance-Based Fiscal Decentralization

Rwanda's model stands out for linking fiscal transfers to performance metrics. Local governments receive funds based on their ability to meet development targets, encouraging efficiency and accountability. This approach has enhanced citizen participation and improved health and education outcomes, though concerns about political centralization persist (Ndayishimiye et al., 2025; Bob & Kebede, 2025; KfW Development Bank, 2022).

3.2.4 India – Panchayati Raj System

India's constitutional amendment in 1992 revitalized the Panchayati Raj system, mandating elected local councils at village, block, and district levels. These bodies manage local development funds and planning. The system has deepened democratic participation, especially among women and marginalized groups, though capacity and corruption issues remain in some states (Sajeev et al., 2025; Qureshi, 2024; Atienza & Go, 2023).

3.2.5 Philippines – Local Government Code of 1991

The Philippines enacted a landmark Local Government Code that devolved substantial powers to provinces, cities, and municipalities. Local governments gained control over health, agriculture, and infrastructure, supported by internal revenue allotments. This reform improved responsiveness and innovation, though disparities in local capacity and political patronage persist (Reyes, 2016; Atienza & Go, 2023; Baldon, 2024).

3.3 History of Decentralization in Economics

In the late 20th century, governments around the world embraced market-oriented reforms as they shifted toward neoliberalism. Neoliberalism is an economic and political ideology that promotes free markets, privatization, deregulation, and minimal government intervention in the economy (Steger & Roy, 2010; Best, 2020). Leaders such as Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan actively promoted minimal state intervention, privatized public services, and deregulated markets (Best, 2020; Hay, 2004). They responded to the economic crises of the 1970s, which included stagflation and fiscal deficits, by rejecting centralized planning and challenging the foundations of Keynesian welfare models (Hay, 2004). As neoliberalism gained momentum, policymakers advanced decentralization not only as a technical adjustment but as an ideological strategy to restructure the role of the state (Brenner & Theodore, 2002; Peck, 2001).

This form of economic decentralization aligned closely with Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) promoted by international financial institutions, particularly across the Global South. These programs operated as instruments of conditionality, requiring recipient states to implement neoliberal reforms such as decentralization, privatization, and market liberalization as prerequisites for financial assistance (Mosley, Harrigan, & Toye, 1991; Mkandawire & Soludo, 1999). Countries including Kenya, Ghana, and Zambia adopted SAPs under the guidance of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank.

In Kenya, reforms during the 1980s and 1990s involved downsizing the public sector, liberalizing trade, and devolving service delivery to local authorities, often without sufficient fiscal transfers or institutional capacity to support the transition (Nyangena, 2007). Omweri (2024b) highlights how decentralization efforts in Kenya and Uganda often lacked meaningful citizen engagement, limiting their transformative potential despite economic restructuring. Ghana adopted SAPs in 1983, leading to widespread privatization and the decentralization of agricultural and health services, as part of a broader effort to reverse economic decline through market-oriented reforms (Konadu-Agyemang, 2000). Zambia undertook similar reforms, shifting service delivery responsibilities to local councils under constrained budgets and limited administrative capacity (Fraser & Lungu, 2007).

Although these reforms were framed as necessary for economic stabilization and growth, they frequently resulted in weakened public institutions, increased inequality, and fragmented accountability. Across Sub-Saharan Africa, more than 40 countries implemented SAPs during the 1980s and 1990s, embedding market logic into governance and fundamentally reshaping the role of the state in development (Craig & Porter, 2006; Mkandawire & Soludo, 1999).

The institutional consequences of neoliberal decentralization extended beyond fiscal realignment to reshape the architecture of local governance. In many cases, decentralization was implemented without corresponding investments in administrative capacity, legal safeguards, or participatory mechanisms. This asymmetry created governance vacuums where local authorities lacked the tools, personnel, and regulatory clarity to manage devolved responsibilities effectively (Rugeiyamu & Msendo, 2025). The emphasis on efficiency and competition often sidelined deliberative processes, weakening the role of civil society and diminishing avenues for democratic accountability (Evans, Richmond, & Shields, 2005). As a result, decentralization under neoliberalism did not uniformly enhance responsiveness or inclusion; instead, it frequently reproduced elite capture, bureaucratic fragmentation, and uneven service delivery across regions (Ekpo, 2008).

Moreover, the technocratic framing of decentralization obscured its political economy dimensions. Presenting decentralization as a neutral tool for development allowed international financial institutions and reform advocates to downplay the distributive conflicts and power asymmetries embedded in its implementation (Faguet, 2024). In practice, decentralization reconfigured state-society relations, shifting the locus of contestation from national parliaments to local arenas where institutional safeguards were often weaker (Agrawal & Ribot, 1999). This shift enabled new forms of patronage, rent-seeking, and informal governance, particularly in contexts where local elites leveraged devolved authority to consolidate power. The depoliticization of decentralization discourse thus masked its role in entrenching neoliberal statecraft, where market imperatives override redistributive commitments and governance becomes a vehicle for capital accumulation rather than public welfare (Gershon, 2025).

3.4 History of Decentralization in Social Movements

Decentralization in social movements is rooted in pre-digital struggles such as peasant uprisings, indigenous resistance, and anti-colonial campaigns. These movements often operated without centralized leadership, relying instead on communal decision-making and local autonomy to mobilize collective action (Williams, 2018). A notable modern example is the 1994 Zapatista uprising in Chiapas, Mexico, where indigenous communities rejected traditional political hierarchies and embraced autonomous governance through local councils. Their use of the internet to share their message globally was groundbreaking at the time and demonstrated how decentralized movements could harness emerging technologies to amplify their voices (Wager & Schulz, 1995).

The Global Justice Movement of the late 1990s and early 2000s, particularly during the 1999 WTO protests in Seattle, further illustrated the power of decentralized coordination. Activists organized through affinity groups—small, self-directed teams united by shared goals—and used consensus-based decision-making to ensure collective agreement (Murphy & Pfaff, 2005). These methods allowed diverse groups to act in solidarity without relying on a central authority. More recent movements have continued this legacy. Occupy Wall Street in 2011 famously rejected hierarchical leadership, instead embracing horizontalism, a structure where all participants have equal say in organizing general assemblies and direct actions (Van Gelder, 2011). Similarly, Black Lives Matter, while initiated by three founders, evolved into a decentralized network of chapters and individuals addressing racial justice in their own communities, connected by shared values and digital platforms (Ince, Rojas, & Davis, 2017; Miranda, 2021).

In contrast, centralized movements like the U.S. Civil Rights Movement under Martin Luther King Jr. relied on charismatic leadership and structured organizations such as the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. This model enabled strategic coordination and media visibility but concentrated decision-making power in a few hands (Lewis, 2014). Decentralized movements, by comparison, distribute power more evenly, allowing for greater adaptability, inclusivity, and resilience, though sometimes at the cost of unified messaging or strategic coherence (Faguet, 2021).

Philosophically, decentralized activism draws from anarchist and libertarian socialist ideologies that emphasize autonomy, mutual aid, and non-hierarchical organization (Prichard, Kinna, Pinta, & Berry, 2013). Feminist organizing principles contribute a focus on intersectionality and collective care, ensuring that diverse identities and lived experiences are acknowledged and supported (Fotaki & Pullen, 2024; Bell, Meriläinen, Taylor, & Tienari, 2019). Indigenous governance models further enrich decentralized activism by valuing

consensus-based decision-making and community stewardship, rooted in ancestral knowledge and relational accountability (Coates, Trudgett, & Page, 2023; SFU Library, 2020).

In today's world of digital activism, climate crises, and global inequality, decentralized movements offer a powerful model for collective action. They enable diverse voices to be heard, foster innovation through local autonomy, and resist co-optation by centralized institutions. As technology continues to reshape how we connect and mobilize, decentralization remains a vital strategy for building resilient, inclusive, and transformative movements across borders and generations.

4. Anatomy of Leaderless Systems

In recent decades, the rise of decentralized movements such as grassroots activism and digital communities has challenged the long-held assumption that effective systems require centralized authority. This shift invites a deeper exploration into the anatomy of leaderless systems, where coordination, influence, and resilience emerge organically rather than through formal hierarchies (Fotaki & Foroughi, 2022; Sorce & Dumitrica, 2022).

According to Salovaara, Vuori, and Collinson (2025), a “leaderless” system operates without a central authority or single point of control. Instead, it relies on decentralized mechanisms to coordinate actions, make decisions, and ensure accountability. These systems emphasize horizontal collaboration, mutual validation, and algorithmic governance, allowing participants to engage autonomously while remaining interconnected. Such organizational models challenge conventional assumptions about leadership and demonstrate how distributed agency can foster resilience and coherence without formal hierarchies (Salovaara et al., 2025). The absence of formal leadership does not imply disorder; rather, it reflects a deliberate move toward distributed agency and collective responsibility (Cebul & Pinckney, 2022).

In this context, the very notion of leadership becomes contested. Traditional models, often rooted in patriarchal, colonial, or capitalist frameworks, are increasingly viewed as inadequate or even obstructive in addressing systemic injustices (Fotaki & Foroughi, 2022). As a result, leaderless systems have gained traction as alternatives that resist domination and promote equity. Decentralized power structures that privilege participation over hierarchy open new possibilities for organizing resistance, fostering solidarity, and reimagining governance in ways that are more inclusive, adaptive, and just (Mengo & Awuor, 2024; Sorce & Dumitrica, 2022).

4.1 What makes a system “Leaderless”?

A “leaderless” system is not merely one without a designated authority figure; it represents a structural and philosophical shift in how decisions are made, validated, and enforced. The three elements: distributed decision making, peer validation, and algorithmic governance. Each plays a distinct yet interconnected role in shaping the anatomy of leaderlessness.

4.1.1 Distributed Decision-Making

The philosophical foundations of distributed decision-making trace back to diverse traditions that challenge centralized authority and emphasize collective agency. Anarchist theory, particularly as articulated by thinkers like Peter Kropotkin and Emma Goldman, advocates for voluntary cooperation and mutual aid as alternatives to hierarchical governance (Western, 2014a). Cybernetics, emerging in the mid-20th century, introduced models of self-regulating systems where feedback loops enable decentralized control—an idea later influential in networked technologies and organizational theory (Swann, 2015; Zargham & Nabben, 2023). Indigenous governance models, such as the consensus-based decision-making of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy, offer long-standing examples of egalitarian structures rooted in relational accountability and communal stewardship (Alfred, 2005). These intellectual lineages converge in contemporary leaderless systems, providing both ethical grounding and practical inspiration for reimagining power and participation (Swann, 2021).

Building on these philosophical foundations, distributed decision-making has evolved into a functional paradigm within modern leaderless systems, where theory informs structure and practice. At the heart of any leaderless system lies the principle of distributed decision-making. In such systems, authority is decentralized and spread across participants rather than concentrated in a single node or figure. Horizontal power structures replace traditional vertical hierarchies, allowing decisions to emerge from consensus, deliberation, or network dynamics rather than top-down directives (Freeman, 1972). This model is commonly observed in grassroots movements, open-source communities, and decentralized autonomous organizations (DAOs) (Zargham & Nabben, 2023). While distributed decision-making fosters resilience, inclusivity, and adaptability,

it also demands robust coordination mechanisms to prevent fragmentation or decision-making paralysis (Swann, 2021).

To function effectively, distributed decision-making systems often rely on technological infrastructures and social protocols that facilitate coordination without centralized control. Digital platforms, consensus algorithms, and collaborative tools play a crucial role in enabling participants to share information, propose actions, and reach agreement asynchronously or in real time (Buterin, 2014; Nabben, 2021). Equally important are cultural norms—such as transparency, mutual accountability, and shared purpose—that sustain trust and coherence across the network (Swann, 2015). Without these scaffolds, the absence of formal leadership can lead to ambiguity, misalignment, or the emergence of informal hierarchies that undermine the system's egalitarian ethos (Freeman, 1972).

Despite these supports, distributed decision-making systems often grapple with scalability and efficiency challenges as they grow in size and complexity. The very mechanisms that promote inclusivity—open deliberation, consensus-building, and participatory input—can become bottlenecks when too many voices compete or when urgency demands swift action (Nabben, 2021). To mitigate this, some systems adopt hybrid models that blend decentralized participation with delegated roles or rotating responsibilities, preserving the ethos of horizontal governance while introducing pragmatic layers of structure (Zargham & Nabben, 2023). These adaptations reflect an ongoing negotiation between idealistic principles and operational realities, revealing the dynamic nature of leaderless systems in practice (Western, 2014a).

4.1.2 Peer Validation

In the absence of a central leader, peer validation becomes the primary mechanism for establishing trust and legitimacy. Actions, contributions, and decisions are evaluated by peers through processes such as voting, reputation systems, or mutual review (Saito & Rose, 2023). This creates a self-regulating ecosystem in which authority is earned through demonstrated value rather than formally assigned. Peer validation is especially critical in systems like blockchain networks, where consensus protocols—such as proof-of-work and proof-of-stake—depend on distributed trust (Mrabet, El Bouanani, & Ben-Azza, 2023). These mechanisms ensure that the system remains accountable even without formal oversight, relying on cryptographic verification and collective agreement rather than centralized enforcement (Dimitriou, 2020).

Moreover, peer validation fosters resilience and adaptability within decentralized systems. Because authority is distributed, the system can better withstand disruptions, manipulations, or failures of individual nodes (Mrabet et al., 2023). This collective scrutiny encourages transparency and discourages malicious behavior, as actors are aware that their actions are subject to communal evaluation (Dimitriou, 2020). In open-source communities, for instance, code contributions are vetted by fellow developers, ensuring quality and security through collaborative oversight (Saito & Rose, 2023). Similarly, in decentralized autonomous organizations (DAOs), proposals are debated and approved by token holders, reinforcing participatory governance. Over time, these peer-driven mechanisms cultivate a culture of meritocracy, where influence is proportional to one's contributions and reputation, rather than hierarchical status or formal credentials (Mrabet et al., 2023).

4.1.3 Algorithmic Governance

Algorithmic governance introduces a new form of leadership embedded directly in code. In this model, rules, incentives, and decision-making processes are encoded into algorithms or smart contracts that execute automatically, reducing human bias and enforcing consistency across the system (Sustainability Directory, 2025). In DAOs and other decentralized platforms, algorithmic governance often replaces traditional bureaucratic structures, enabling scalable and efficient coordination (Trends Wide, 2025). However, this approach raises important questions about transparency, interpretability, and ethical design—specifically, who writes the rules and who is responsible for auditing them (Markaicode, 2025).

Furthermore, the delegation of governance to code introduces a new layer of power dynamics, where developers and protocol architects effectively become the framers of institutional logic (Trends Wide, 2025). Their design choices—often embedded in smart contracts—can shape everything from voting thresholds to resource allocation, yet these decisions may lack democratic oversight or broad stakeholder input (Sustainability Directory, 2025). This opacity can lead to governance capture, where a small group controls critical parameters under the guise of neutrality. Additionally, the interpretability of algorithmic rules poses challenges for non-technical participants, potentially excluding them from meaningful engagement (Markaicode, 2025). To mitigate these risks, some DAOs are experimenting with modular governance frameworks, where rules can be proposed, debated, and updated through collective deliberation. Others advocate for formal audits, open-source transparency, and participatory design processes to ensure that

algorithmic governance remains accountable, inclusive, and aligned with community values (Sustainability Directory, 2025; Markaicode, 2025).

4.2 Case Studies

4.2.1 Bitcoin: Code as Governance

Bitcoin exemplifies a radically decentralized financial system. It operates without a central bank, CEO, or governing body. Instead, its rules are encoded in software and enforced through a proof-of-work consensus mechanism, shifting authority from institutions to algorithms. Participants collectively validate transactions and maintain the network, fostering resilience through distributed ledger technology and open-source collaboration (Fidelity Digital Assets, 2022). However, this model raises concerns about developer influence, energy consumption, and the interpretability of governance logic (Blockworks, 2023; D-Central, 2023). In essence, Bitcoin replaces traditional leadership with cryptographic trust and algorithmic coordination.

4.2.2 Wikipedia: Crowdsourced Knowledge and Minimal Hierarchy

Wikipedia demonstrates how peer validation can sustain a vast, global knowledge repository without centralized editorial control. Contributors collaboratively edit and update articles, with legitimacy emerging through communal review and citation standards. While administrators exist, their role is largely facilitative, and disputes are resolved through discussion and consensus rather than top-down mandates (Wikipedia, n.d.). This model showcases the power of horizontal collaboration and mutual accountability, though it also grapples with challenges such as bias, vandalism, and uneven participation (Poncela-Casasnovas & Moreno, 2023; Jemielniak, 2022). Wikipedia's success lies in its ability to harness collective intelligence while maintaining a flexible, low-hierarchy structure.

4.2.3 DAOs: Smart Contracts as Institutional Logic

Decentralized Autonomous Organizations (DAOs) represent a new frontier in algorithmic governance. Built on blockchain platforms, DAOs use smart contracts to automate decision-making, fund allocation, and rule enforcement. Members vote on proposals, and outcomes are executed automatically by code, removing the need for traditional managers or executives (Cointelegraph, 2023). Leadership is embedded directly into the system's architecture, yet DAOs face challenges around transparency, inclusivity, and the concentration of power among developers or token holders (Editorialge, 2023; Metana, 2023). Their promise lies in programmable institutions that evolve through participatory design, but their risks highlight the need for ethical frameworks and modular governance.

4.2.4 Occupy Wall Street

The Occupy Wall Street movement emerged in 2011 as a response to growing economic inequality and corporate influence in American politics. Notably leaderless, it relied on horizontal organization and consensus-based decision-making through general assemblies. Protesters gathered in Zuccotti Park and other public spaces, using hand signals and open forums to deliberate and coordinate actions (Symer, 2023). Social media played a crucial role in amplifying the movement's message, particularly the "We are the 99%" slogan. While Occupy succeeded in shifting public discourse around wealth disparity, its lack of formal leadership and unified demands made sustained policy impact difficult, highlighting both the strengths and limitations of decentralized mobilization (Calhoun, 2013; Woods, 2024).

4.2.5 Arab Spring

Between 2010 and 2012, the Arab Spring swept across the Middle East and North Africa, catalyzing revolutions in Tunisia, Egypt, Libya, and Yemen. These uprisings were largely spontaneous and leaderless, driven by youth, civil society actors, and ordinary citizens frustrated with authoritarian regimes, corruption, and economic hardship (Al-Qteishat, 2024). Social media platforms like Facebook and Twitter enabled rapid coordination and global visibility, allowing protesters to bypass state-controlled media (Clarke & Kocak, 2018). The absence of centralized leadership made the movements difficult to suppress, but also complicated post-revolution transitions. In many cases, the lack of unified vision or leadership led to power vacuums and political instability, underscoring the double-edged nature of leaderless resistance (Wolfsfeld, Segev, & Sheaffer, 2013).

4.2.6 Hong Kong Protests

The 2019–2020 Hong Kong protests against a proposed extradition bill exemplified a highly adaptive and decentralized movement. Inspired by Bruce Lee’s “Be water” philosophy, protesters avoided fixed hierarchies and instead embraced fluid, leaderless coordination (Dapiran, 2019). They used encrypted messaging apps like Telegram and offline tools such as AirDrop to organize flash mobs, distribute supplies, and share real-time updates (Kwong & Siu, 2020). This structure allowed the movement to respond quickly to police tactics and maintain momentum despite crackdowns. However, the lack of formal leadership made it difficult to negotiate with authorities or consolidate demands, and the movement faced challenges in sustaining long-term political gains (Tang, 2022; Purbrick, 2019).

4.2.7 Black Lives Matter

Black Lives Matter (BLM) began in 2013 as a hashtag following the acquittal of George Zimmerman in the killing of Trayvon Martin, and evolved into a global movement against systemic racism and police brutality. BLM is intentionally decentralized, with autonomous chapters operating under shared principles but without a central governing body. The movement leverages viral videos, social media campaigns, and grassroots organizing to mobilize support and pressure institutions (Jewish Council for Public Affairs, 2020). This structure allows for broad participation and adaptability across contexts, but also leads to messaging fragmentation and internal tensions. Despite these challenges, BLM has achieved significant cultural and policy shifts, demonstrating the power of distributed activism (Azevedo, Marques, & Micheli, 2022; Hoffman et al., 2016).

4.2.8 Kenya’s Gen Z Protests

In 2024, Kenya witnessed a wave of youth-led protests against the Finance Bill and broader governance issues. Spearheaded by Gen Z, the movement was strikingly leaderless, coordinated through platforms like X (formerly Twitter), TikTok, and WhatsApp. Protesters used memes, videos, and hashtags to galvanize public outrage and organize demonstrations (JURIST Staff, 2024). The absence of formal leadership made the movement difficult to co-opt or suppress, and its digital fluency enabled rapid mobilization. Omweri (2024) provides a detailed analysis of this mobilization, arguing that Gen Z’s activism redefined democratic engagement by leveraging decentralized digital tools and grassroots advocacy. His qualitative study highlights how these youth, despite feeling alienated from traditional politics, forced government amendments and reshaped civic discourse. However, the movement also faced challenges in sustaining momentum and engaging in formal negotiations (Wekesa, 2025; Musya, 2025; Lee, 2025). Kenya’s Gen Z uprising illustrates how digital-native activism can thrive without traditional figureheads, while still exerting significant influence on policy and governance.

5. Benefits and Challenges of Leaderless System

Leaderless systems, whether in social movements, decentralized organizations, or digital networks, represent a paradigm shift from traditional hierarchical models. They prioritize distributed decision-making, collective agency, and horizontal coordination. While this approach offers compelling advantages, it also introduces unique complexities.

5.1 Benefits of Leaderless Systems

5.1.1 Resilience and Redundancy

Leaderless systems exhibit structural resilience due to their decentralized architecture. Unlike hierarchical models that rely on central authority, these systems distribute responsibilities and decision-making across multiple nodes or participants. This design eliminates single points of failure, allowing the system to continue functioning even when individual components are compromised. Such redundancy enhances the system’s ability to withstand external disruptions, censorship, or leadership vacuums. Brafman and Beckstrom (2006) illustrate this through the metaphor of the starfish, where severed limbs regenerate, showing how decentralized organizations can self-repair and adapt in ways that traditional models cannot.

5.1.2 Democratization of Power

One of the most compelling advantages of leaderless systems is their capacity to democratize power. By diffusing authority across participants, these systems reduce the risk of authoritarian control, elite capture, or

hierarchical dominance. This fosters a culture of inclusivity, equity, and shared ownership, where diverse voices contribute to shaping collective outcomes. Flanigan (2023) argues that leaderless management promotes egalitarian workplace relations by granting workers more autonomy and participatory power, often resembling small-scale democracies. Such structures challenge conventional leadership paradigms and offer alternatives to the “lonely superhero” model of leadership that dominates many corporate and political spaces (Garvey & Diochon, 2023).

5.1.3 Innovation through Open Participation

Leaderless systems also catalyze innovation by encouraging open participation. In the absence of rigid hierarchies, individuals are empowered to contribute ideas freely, fostering a dynamic environment of experimentation and creativity. This openness accelerates problem-solving and enables rapid adaptation to changing conditions. Coop (2018) notes that peer-to-peer models, enabled by digital technologies, facilitate the emergence of new ideas across distributed networks, often outperforming traditional top-down innovation pipelines. The collaborative ethos of leaderless systems thus becomes a fertile ground for transformative thinking and collective intelligence.

5.2 Challenges of Leaderless Systems

5.2.1 Coordination Complexity

Leaderless systems often struggle with coordination due to the absence of centralized leadership. Aligning goals, strategies, and actions across diverse participants can be slow and fragmented, particularly in large or heterogeneous groups. Ivanov and Maritz (2023) highlight that many organizations operating without clear leadership structures suffer from inertia and pseudo-hierarchies, which obscure decision-making and hinder strategic alignment. Collaborative governance models attempt to mitigate this by fostering shared understanding and co-production, but they still face challenges in synchronizing efforts across multiple actors (Bianchi, Nasib, & Rivenbark, 2021).

5.2.2 Accountability Gaps

In systems where no one is formally in charge, assigning responsibility becomes difficult. This lack of clear accountability can lead to role ambiguity, inconsistent follow-through, and challenges in addressing misconduct or failure. Ivanov and Maritz (2023) argue that leaderless organizations often operate under a façade of structure, where roles exist in name but lack enforceable authority, resulting in systemic accountability vacuums. Such gaps can undermine trust and effectiveness, especially when stakeholders are unclear about who is responsible for outcomes or oversight.

5.2.3 Vulnerability to Manipulation or Fragmentation

Leaderless systems are particularly vulnerable to manipulation, misinformation, and internal fragmentation. Without clear boundaries or oversight mechanisms, bad actors can exploit the openness of the system, steering collective efforts toward narrow or disruptive agendas. Fragmentation may also arise from competing interests or ideological divides, weakening cohesion and strategic focus. Bianchi et al. (2021) note that collaborative governance efforts often falter when fragmentation leads to inconsistent policy implementation or when stakeholders fail to coalesce around shared outcomes. In such contexts, the absence of leadership can exacerbate instability rather than mitigate it.

6. Philosophical and Ethical Implications

6.1 What Does Leadership Mean When No One Leads?

The concept of leadership traditionally implies direction, hierarchy, and authority. Yet in leaderless systems, leadership becomes a distributed phenomenon—emerging through collective action, shared norms, and situational influence. This challenges classical definitions rooted in positional power and intentional control. As Garvey and Diochon (2023) argue, leaderless organizations reframe leadership as a relational and ecological process, where influence is exercised through facilitation, coordination, and moral presence rather than command. Leadership, in this context, is not absent but diffused—manifesting through roles that rotate, dissolve, or emerge organically.

6.2 Can Trust Be Built Without Authority?

Trust in leaderless systems must be cultivated through transparency, shared values, and institutional scaffolding rather than formal authority. Dowding and Taylor (2024) explore this through the lens of algorithmic decision-making, arguing that trust can be sustained when systems—human or machine—are embedded within accountable institutional frameworks. In the absence of centralized authority, mechanisms such as peer validation, open-source auditing, and participatory governance become essential. Ethical leadership, even when informal, plays a critical role in modeling integrity and fostering trust (Adrees, 2023). Thus, trust without authority is possible—but it demands intentional design and cultural reinforcement.

6.3 Ethical Dilemmas in Algorithmic Decision-Making and Collective Responsibility

As leaderless systems increasingly rely on algorithms to coordinate decisions, new ethical dilemmas emerge. Frimpong (2025) identifies four critical principles for ethical algorithmic governance: intentionality, interpretability, moral authorship, and justice. These principles highlight the tension between automation and accountability—especially when decisions affect vulnerable populations. Algorithms may obscure responsibility, creating moral vacuums where no single actor claims authorship of outcomes. This raises profound questions about collective responsibility: who is accountable when harm arises from a system no one fully controls? As Dowding and Taylor (2024) note, algorithmic externalities—harms borne by those excluded from decision-making—demand institutional remedies that restore moral clarity and democratic oversight.

7. Applications in the Digital Age

In the digital age, decentralized technologies are reshaping governance, transparency, and civic engagement. Social media platforms are increasingly experimenting with decentralized moderation models that shift control from centralized corporate entities to user communities. These models, exemplified by platforms like Mastodon and Bluesky, employ federated protocols and open-source governance to promote transparency and participatory decision-making (Ciriello et al., 2025). Despite their promise, decentralized social media (DSM) platforms face challenges related to scalability, usability, and governance efficiency, which limit their adoption compared to centralized giants like Facebook and YouTube (Ciriello et al., 2025).

Blockchain technology is also transforming supply chain management by enabling tamper-proof, transparent records of transactions. This innovation enhances traceability, reduces fraud, and fosters ethical accountability across industries such as agriculture, pharmaceuticals, and fashion (Cengiz, 2023). Blockchain's "trustless" architecture allows stakeholders to verify exchanges without relying on centralized authorities, thereby improving trust and operational efficiency. The European Blockchain Observatory (2023) further emphasizes blockchain's role in creating resilient, transparent systems that can adapt to global disruptions and regulatory demands.

In the realm of civic technology, digital platforms are being deployed to facilitate participatory governance and policy transparency. These tools—ranging from open-data dashboards to smart contracts—can empower citizens and optimize urban services. However, as Omweri (2024b) cautions, the design of such platforms must be intentionally inclusive; without participatory intent, digital governance tools risk reproducing existing patterns of exclusion, particularly among marginalized communities. The convergence of decentralized technologies and civic engagement thus presents both opportunities and risks, demanding careful attention to design, equity, and implementation.

8. Conclusion

Leaderless systems represent a transformative shift in governance, activism, and organizational design. Rather than relying on centralized authority, these systems operate through distributed decision-making, peer validation, and algorithmic governance. They challenge traditional leadership paradigms by embedding coordination in infrastructure, protocols, and community norms.

The study emphasizes that leaderless systems are not chaotic or disorganized; they are structured around collective agency and technological scaffolding. From blockchain networks and DAOs to social movements like Occupy Wall Street and Kenya's Gen Z protests, these systems demonstrate resilience, inclusivity, and adaptability. However, they also face challenges such as coordination complexity, accountability gaps, and vulnerability to manipulation.

Philosophically, leaderless systems reframe leadership as a relational and ecological process. Ethically, they demand new frameworks for trust, responsibility, and algorithmic transparency. As digital technologies

continue to reshape civic and institutional landscapes, leaderless systems offer both promise and peril—requiring intentional design, inclusive governance, and ongoing critical reflection.

9. Recommendations

- i. Ensure decentralized platforms are accessible to diverse stakeholders, especially marginalized communities. Apply participatory design principles to prevent exclusionary dynamics.
- ii. Develop transparent, interpretable, and auditable algorithms. Incorporate ethical principles such as intentionality, justice, and moral authorship into algorithmic decision-making.
- iii. Introduce modular governance frameworks that enable collective oversight and rule updates. Use peer validation systems to reinforce responsibility and discourage manipulation.
- iv. Blend decentralized participation with pragmatic structures like rotating roles or delegated responsibilities to enhance scalability and coordination. Recognize that pure leaderlessness may require adaptive scaffolding.
- v. Equip citizens with the skills to engage meaningfully in decentralized systems. Promote awareness of algorithmic governance and its implications for democracy and equity.

Declarations

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Competing Interests

The author declare no competing interests.

Use of AI Tool

This manuscript benefited from the use of Microsoft Copilot (Microsoft Copilot, September, 2025 version an AI-powered research and writing assistant. The tool was employed to support literature synthesis, enhance clarity in academic phrasing, and streamline the organization of empirical findings. Specifically, Copilot assisted in:

- Structuring the literature review to align with thematic and theoretical frameworks
- Refining statistical interpretations and ensuring coherence in methodological descriptions
- Improving readability and consistency in the discussion and conclusion sections

The use of AI was limited to editorial and analytical support; all conceptualization, data analysis, and scholarly interpretations were conducted by the author. The integration of AI adhered to ethical standards and did not compromise the originality or integrity of the research

References

1. Abu Shair, O. J. A. R. (1997). *Privatization and development*. In 5 Privatization, Decentralization, Participation and Development. Springer. https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/978-1-349-25374-6_5.pdf
2. Adie, B. U., Tate, M., & Valentine, E. (2024). Digital leadership in the public sector: A scoping review and outlook. *International Review of Public Administration*, 29(1), 42–58. <https://doi.org/10.1080/12294659.2024.2323847>
3. Adrees, B. (2023). The role of ethical leadership in fostering organizational trust and integrity. *ISAR Journal of Economics and Business Management*, 1(1), 1–15. <https://isarpublisher.com/backend/public/assets/articles/1687955317-The-Role-Of-Ethical-Leadership-In-Fostering-Organizational-Trust-And-Integrity.pdf>
4. Agrawal, A., & Ribot, J. (1999). Accountability in decentralization: A framework with South Asian and West African cases. *The Journal of Developing Areas*, 33(4), 473–502.
5. Alfred, T. (2005). *Wasáse: Indigenous pathways of action and freedom*. Broadview Press.
6. Allain-Dupré, D. (2020). *Decentralisation trends across OECD countries: A comparative perspective*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/f7e9f11f-en>
7. Al-Qteishat, A. S. A. (2024). Social media and political protest mobilization: Unveiling the dynamics of the Arab Spring 2.0. *Current Psychology*, 43, 34538–34562. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-024-06942-1>
8. Andersson, K. P., & Ostrom, E. (2008). Analyzing decentralized resource regimes from a polycentric perspective. *Policy Sciences*, 41(1), 71–93. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11077-007-9055-6>
9. Arban, E., Martinico, G., & Palermo, F. (2021). *Federalism and constitutional law: The Italian contribution to comparative regionalism*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003173981>
10. Atienza, M. E. L., & Go, J. R. (2023). *Assessing local governance and autonomy in the Philippines: Three decades of the 1991 Local Government Code*. UP Center for Integrative and Development Studies.

11. Azevedo, F., Marques, T., & Micheli, L. (2022). In pursuit of racial equality: Identifying the determinants of support for the Black Lives Matter movement with a systematic review and multiple meta-analyses. *Perspectives on Politics*, 20(4), 1305–1327. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592722001098>
12. Bahl, R., & Bird, R. M. (2018). *Fiscal decentralization and local finance in developing countries*. Edward Elgar.
13. Balcerzak, A. P., Nica, E., Rogalska, E., Poliak, M., Klieštík, T., & Sabie, O.-M. (2022). Blockchain technology and smart contracts in decentralized governance systems. *Administrative Sciences*, 12(3), 96. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci12030096>
14. Baldon, L. (2024). Essay on the impact of Local Government Code of 1991 on economy, social and decentralization of LGUs. *Academia.edu*. <https://www.academia.edu/109876543>
15. Bardhan, P., & Mookherjee, D. (Eds.). (2006). *Decentralization and local governance in developing countries: A comparative perspective*. MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/2297.001.0001>
16. Bednar, J. (2008). *The robust federation: Principles of design*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511801369>
17. Bell, E., Meriläinen, S., Taylor, S., & Tienari, J. (2019). Time's up! Feminist theory and activism meets organization studies. *Human Relations*, 72(1), 4–22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726718790067>
18. Benz, A., & Broschek, J. (Eds.). (2013). *Federal dynamics: Continuity, change, and the varieties of federalism*. Oxford University Press.
19. Best, J. (2020). The quiet failures of early neoliberalism: From rational expectations to Keynesianism in reverse. *Review of International Studies*, 46(5), 594–612. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210520000169>
20. Bianchi, C., Nasib, G., & Rivenbark, W. C. (2021). Implementing collaborative governance: Models, experiences, and challenges. *Public Management Review*, 23(11), 1581–1589. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2021.1878777>
21. Bob, G., & Kebede, S. (2025). Assessing the impact of decentralization policy on governance functions in Rwanda: A comprehensive review. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 13(3), 468–480. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2025.133032>
22. Boko, S. H. (2002). *Decentralization and reform in Africa*. Springer.
23. Brafman, O., & Beckstrom, R. A. (2006). *The starfish and the spider: The unstoppable power of leaderless organizations*. Portfolio.
24. Brenner, N., & Theodore, N. (2002). Cities and the geographies of “actually existing neoliberalism.” *Antipode*, 34(3), 349–379. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8330.00246>
25. Buterin, V. (2014). *DAOs, DACs, DAs and more: An incomplete terminology guide*. Ethereum Foundation. <https://blog.ethereum.org/2014/05/06/daos-dacs-das-and-more-an-incomplete-terminology-guide/>
26. Buterin, V. (2020). The meaning of decentralization. *Ethereum Foundation Blog*. <https://ethereum.org/en/blog/2020/05/06/meaning-decentralization/>
27. Calhoun, C. (2013). Occupy Wall Street in perspective. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 64(1), 26–38. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12001>
28. Cardoso, A. G. (2023). Decentralized autonomous organizations—DAOs: The convergence of technology, law, governance, and behavioral economics. *MIT Computational Law Report*. <https://law.mit.edu/pub/decentralizedautonomousorganizations>
29. Cebul, M., & Pinckney, J. (2022). *Nonviolent action in the era of digital authoritarianism: Hardships and innovations* (Special Report No. 506). United States Institute of Peace. https://www.usip.org/sites/default/files/2022-02/sr_506-nonviolent_action_in_the_era_of_digital_authoritarianism_hardships_and_innovations.pdf
30. Cengiz, F. (2023). Blockchain governance and governance via blockchain: Decentralized utopia or centralized dystopia? *Policy Design and Practice*, 6(4), 446–464. <https://doi.org/10.1080/25741292.2023.2247203>
31. Ciriello, R. F., Marx, J., Cheong, M., Mueller-Bloch, C., & Mathiassen, L. (2025). Decentralized social media. *Business & Information Systems Engineering*. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s12599-025-00952-4>
32. Clarke, K., & Kocak, K. (2018). Launching revolution: Social media and the Egyptian uprising's first movers. *British Journal of Political Science*, 50(3), 1025–1045. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123418000194>
33. Coates, S. K., Trudgett, M., & Page, S. (2023). Indigenous institutional theory: A new theoretical framework and methodological tool. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 50, 903–920. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-022-00533-4>
34. Commonwealth Secretariat. (2010). *Decentralisation in Tanzania*. Commonwealth iLibrary. <https://doi.org/10.14217/9781848591086-en>
35. Conyers, D. (2007). Decentralisation and service delivery: Lessons from Sub-Saharan Africa. *IDS Bulletin*, 38(1), 18–32. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1759-5436.2007.tb00334.x>
36. Coop, T. (2018). Towards leaderless organizations? The impact of new technology on leadership and learning. In S. Kempster, A. P. Turner, & G. Edwards (Eds.), *Constructing leadership: Reflections on leadership scholarship* (pp. 203–217). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137264237_13
37. Craig, D., & Porter, D. (2006). *Development beyond neoliberalism: Governance, poverty reduction and political economy*. Routledge.
38. Crook, R. C., & Manor, J. (1998). *Democracy and decentralisation in South Asia and West Africa: Participation, accountability and performance*. Cambridge University Press.
39. Dahl, R. A. (1998). *On democracy*. Yale University Press.
40. Dapiran, A. (2019). *City on fire: The fight for Hong Kong*. Scribe Publications.
41. Dimitriou, T. (2020). *Decentralized reputation*. IACR Cryptology ePrint Archive. <https://eprint.iacr.org/2020/761.pdf>

42. Dowding, K., & Taylor, B. R. (2024). Algorithmic decision-making, agency costs, and institution-based trust. *Philosophy & Technology*, 37(68). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-024-00757-5>
43. Ekpo, A. H. (2008). *Decentralization and service delivery: A framework*. African Economic Research Consortium. https://africaportal.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/AkpanEkpo_DecentralizationandServiceDeliveryRevised.pdf
44. Esposito, M., Tse, T., & Goh, D. (2025). Decentralizing governance: Exploring the dynamics and challenges of digital commons and DAOs. *Frontiers in Blockchain*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fbloc.2025.1538227>
45. European Blockchain Observatory. (2023). *Blockchain for supply chain transparency*. <https://www.eublockchainforum.eu/reports>
46. Evans, B., Richmond, T., & Shields, J. (2005). Structuring neoliberal governance: The nonprofit sector, emerging new modes of control and the marketisation of service delivery. *Policy and Society*, 24(1), 73–97. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1449-4035\(05\)70050-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1449-4035(05)70050-3)
47. Faguet, J. P. (2013). *Decentralization and governance*. *World Development*, 53, 2–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2013.01.002>
48. Faguet, J. P. (2023). *Decentralization and development: The role of democratic institutions*. In G. Capano, M. Howlett, & M. Ramesh (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of policy design* (2nd ed., pp. 215–229). Routledge.
49. Faguet, J. P. (2024, March 5). *Decentralisation 'done correctly' — politics, hope, and global variations*. LSE International Development. <https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/internationaldevelopment/2024/03/05/decentralisation-done-correctly-politics-hope-and-global-variations>
50. Faguet, J.-P. (2021). *Understanding decentralization: Theory, evidence and method, with a focus on least-developed countries*. London School of Economics. <https://hdl.handle.net/10419/251596>
51. Flanigan, J. (2023). Leaderless work and workplace participation. In B. Garvey & P. F. Diochon (Eds.), *Coaching in leaderless organizations* (pp. 157–172). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-04593-6_10
52. Fotaki, M., & Foroughi, H. (2022). Extinction Rebellion: Green activism and the fantasy of leaderlessness in a decentralized movement. *Leadership*, 18(2), 224–246. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17427150211005578>
53. Fotaki, M., & Pullen, A. (2024). Feminist theories and activist practices in organization studies. *Organization Studies*, 45(4), 593–616. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01708406231209861>
54. Fraser, A., & Lungu, J. (2007). *For whom the windfalls? Winners and losers in the privatisation of Zambia's copper mines*. Civil Society Trade Network of Zambia.
55. Freeman, J. (1972). *The tyranny of structurelessness*. *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, 17, 151–164.
56. Frimpong, V. (2025). Algorithmic authority and the complexities of delegated decision-making: Case studies on ethical challenges for 21st-century leadership. *International Journal of Organizational Leadership*, 14, 637–655. https://ijol.cikd.ca/article_60868_d33fe796e7ee00540d02f8b2199bc043.pdf
57. Fung, A. (2006). Varieties of participation in complex governance. *Public Administration Review*, 66(s1), 66–75. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00667.x>
58. Garvey, B., & Diochon, P. F. (2023). Developing for leaderless organizations: Two eco-friendly coaching practices. In B. Garvey & P. F. Diochon (Eds.), *Coaching in leaderless organizations* (pp. 35–52). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-04593-6_3
59. Gershon, L. (2025, September 8). From neoliberalism to Trumpism. *JSTOR Daily*. <https://daily.jstor.org/from-neoliberalism-to-trumpism/>
60. Gherghina, S., Tap, P., & Soare, S. (2023). Participatory budgeting and the perception of collective empowerment: Institutional design and limited political interference. *Acta Politica*, 58, 573–590. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41269-022-00273-4>
61. Gumisiriza, P. (2018). Neoliberal policies and impact on developing countries. In A. Farazmand (Ed.), *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5_3782-1
62. Hassan, S., & Filippi, P. D. (2021). Decentralized autonomous organization: Governance by algorithm. *Internet Policy Review*, 10(2). <https://doi.org/10.14763/2021.2.1550>
63. Hay, C. (2004). The normalizing role of rationalist assumptions in the institutional embedding of neoliberalism. *Economy and Society*, 33(4), 500–527. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0308514042000285223>
64. Hoffman, L., Granger, N., Vallejos, L., & Moats, M. (2016). An existential–humanistic perspective on Black Lives Matter and contemporary protest movements. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 56(6), 595–611. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022167816652273>
65. Hooghe, L., & Marks, G. (2003). Unraveling the central state, but how? Types of multi-level governance. *American Political Science Review*, 97(2), 233–243. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055403000646>
66. Hooghe, L., Marks, G., & Schakel, A. H. (2010). *The rise of regional authority: A comparative analysis of 42 democracies*. Routledge.
67. Ince, J., Rojas, F., & Davis, C. A. (2017). The social media response to Black Lives Matter: How Twitter users interact with Black Lives Matter through hashtag use. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 40(11), 1814–1830. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2017.1334931>
68. IRC & WaterAid. (2005). *Making decentralization by devolution work in water and sanitation service delivery: A case study*. <https://www.ircwash.org/resources/making-decentralization-devolution-work-water-and-sanitation-service-delivery-case-study>

69. Ivanov, S., & Maritz, A. (2023). Leaderless organizations: Identifying leadership vacuum in organizations. *Cogent Business & Management*, 10(1), 2220200. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2023.2220200>
70. Jewish Council for Public Affairs. (2020). *What is Black Lives Matter? Differences within BLM*. <https://www.jcouncil.org/sites/default/files/documents/BLM%20and%20M4BL%20%28002%29%206.30%20.pdf>
71. Keating, M. (1998). *The new regionalism in Western Europe: Territorial restructuring and political change*. Edward Elgar.
72. KfW Development Bank. (2022). *Ex post evaluation: Decentralisation and good governance, Rwanda*. <https://www.kfw-entwicklungsbank.de/PDF/Evaluation/Results-2022/Rwanda-Decentralisation-2022.pdf>
73. Konadu-Agyemang, K. (2000). The best of times and the worst of times: Structural adjustment programs and uneven development in Africa: The case of Ghana. *The Professional Geographer*, 52(3), 469–483. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0033-0124.00236>
74. Kuckartz, U. (2019). Qualitative text analysis: A systematic approach. In *Compendium for Early Career Researchers in Mathematics Education* (pp. 181–197). Springer. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-030-15636-7_8
75. Kwong, J., & Siu, E. (2020). Be water – Insights into the Hong Kong citizen protest movement. *Zeitgeist – Goethe-Institut*. <https://www.goethe.de/prj/zei/en/art/22072105.html>
76. Lee, D. (2025). The impact of Generation Z on Kenya's 2024 finance protests. *Journal of Student Research*, 14(1). <https://doi.org/10.47611/jsrhs.v14i1.8611>
77. Lelegwe, S. L. (2022). *Influence of devolution on public service delivery: A case of Samburu County, Kenya* [Master's thesis, University of Nairobi]. University of Nairobi Repository. <https://erepository.uonbi.ac.ke/handle/11295/161234>
78. Lewis, J. (2014). APA Presidential Citation: Rep. John Lewis. *American Psychological Association*. <https://www.apa.org/about/governance/president/citation/lewis>
79. Litvack, J., Ahmad, J., & Bird, R. (1998). *Rethinking decentralization in developing countries*. World Bank. <https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documents-reports/documentdetail/438741468765585831>
80. Madaha, R. M. (2022). Decentralisation and the empowerment of local communities in Tanzania with special focus on water issues. *Educational Action Research*, 30(4), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09650792.2022.2162097>
81. Markaicode. (2025, May 13). *Ethical AI oversight: How DAOs can govern autonomous code updates*. <https://markaicode.com/dao-governance-autonomous-updates/>
82. Mbate, M. (2017). Decentralisation, governance and accountability: Theory and evidence. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 53(10), 1674–1695. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2016.1265948>
83. Mengo, O., & Awuor, M. (2024). Digital activism in Africa and the Gen Z protests: The youth are leading the way. *Hivos*. <https://hivos.org/opinion/digital-activism-in-africa-and-the-gen-z-protests-the-youth-are-leading-the-way/>
84. Miranda, D. F. (2021). The violence of leadership in Black Lives Matter. In *The Movement for Black Lives: Philosophical Perspectives* (pp. 243–262). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197507773.003.0012>
85. Mkandawire, T., & Soludo, C. C. (1999). *Our continent, our future: African perspectives on structural adjustment*. CODESRIA.
86. Montesquieu. (1989). *The spirit of the laws* (T. Nugent, Trans.; revised by J. V. Prichard). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1748)
87. Moore, N. (2018). Analysing desk research. In *How to do research: A practical guide to designing and managing research projects* (pp. 112–114). Facet Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.29085/9781856049825.012>
88. Mosley, P., Harrigan, J., & Toye, J. (1991). *Aid and power: The World Bank and policy-based lending* (Vol. 1). Routledge.
89. Mrabet, K., El Bouanani, F., & Ben-Azza, H. (2023). Dynamic decentralized reputation system from blockchain and secure multiparty computation. *Journal of Sensor and Actuator Networks*, 12(1), 14. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jsan12010014>
90. Muriu, A. R. (2013). *Decentralization, citizen participation and local public service delivery: A study on the nature and influence of citizen participation on decentralized service delivery in Kenya* (Master's thesis). University of Potsdam. <https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/104749/1/749929790.pdf>
91. Murphy, G. H., & Pfaff, S. (2005). Thinking locally, acting globally? What the Seattle WTO protests tell us about the Global Justice Movement. In D. E. Davis (Ed.), *Political Power and Social Theory* (Vol. 17, pp. 151–176). Emerald Group Publishing. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0198-8719\(04\)17005-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0198-8719(04)17005-1)
92. Musya, J. K. (2025). Generation Z revolts and implications on political change in Kenya: Lessons learned. *Journal of African Interdisciplinary Studies*, 9(7), 14–24. <https://repository.daystar.ac.ke/handle/123456789/7100>
93. Mwenda, A. K. (2010). Economic and administrative implications of the devolution framework established by the Constitution of Kenya. *Institute of Economic Affairs*. <https://ieakenya.or.ke/downloads.php?page=1>
94. Nabben, K. (2021). *Decentralized governance: The politics of blockchain communities*. RMIT University.
95. Nadeem, M. (2016). Analyzing good governance and decentralization in developing countries. *Journal of Political Sciences & Public Affairs*, 4(3), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.4172/2332-0761.1000213>

96. Namfukwe, P. M. (2024). Governance in the digital age: Challenges and opportunities. *International Journal of Academic Multidisciplinary Research*, 7(15), 1–10. <http://ijeais.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/7/IJAMR240715.pdf>
97. Ndayishimiye, C., Nduwayezu, R., Sowada, C., & Dubas-Jakóbczyk, K. (2025). Performance-based financing in Rwanda: A qualitative analysis of healthcare provider perspectives. *BMC Health Services Research*, 25, Article 418. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-025-12605-z>
98. Nguyen, T. N. M., Saunders, R., & Dermody, G. (2021). The use of theory in qualitative research: Challenges, development of a framework and exemplar. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 77(12), 5102–5112. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1111/jan.15053>
99. Nkanata, M. G. (2024). Evaluating Huduma Centres e-government initiatives for sustainable delivery of services in public organizations. In *Information, Knowledge, and Technology for Teaching and Research in Africa* (pp. 131–151). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-60267-2_6
100. Nyangena, W. (2007). *Environmental policy in Kenya: Context and implications for resource conservation*. Institute of Policy Analysis and Research.
101. Nyanjom, O. (2011). *Devolution in Kenya's new constitution*. Society for International Development. https://constitutionnet.org/sites/default/files/nyanjom_devolution_in_kenyas_new_constitution.pdf
102. Okoko, J. M., Tunison, S., & Walker, K. D. (2023). *Varieties of qualitative research methods: Selected contextual perspectives*. Springer. <https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-3-031-04394-9>
103. Omweri, F. S. (2024). Youth-led policy advocacy in Africa: A qualitative analysis of Generation Z's mobilization efforts against fiscal legislation in Kenya and its implications for democratic governance in the continent. *International Journal of Innovative Scientific Research*, 2(3). <https://ijisr.net/ijisr/article/view/8>
104. Omweri, F. S. (2024a). The constitutional eschatology of decentralization in Kenya: Exploring federalism's role in shaping the future of devolution and regional autonomy. *International Journal of Innovative Scientific Research*, 2(3), 37–67. <https://ijisr.net/ijisr/article/view/10>
105. Omweri, F. S. (2024b). *Governing without citizens? A comparative analysis of rural local governments' capacity for participatory governance in Kenya and Uganda*. *Social Sciences and Humanities Journal*, 8(9), 4920–4936.
106. Peck, J. (2001). Neoliberalizing states: Thin policies/hard outcomes. *Progress in Human Geography*, 25(3), 445–455. <https://doi.org/10.1191/030913201680191772>
107. Piattoni, S. (2010). *The theory of multi-level governance: Conceptual, empirical, and normative challenges*. Oxford University Press.
108. Pratchett, L. (2004). Local autonomy, local democracy and the 'new localism'. *Political Studies*, 52(2), 358–375. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.2004.00484.x>
109. Prichard, A., Kinna, R., Pinta, S., & Berry, D. (Eds.). (2013). *Libertarian socialism: Politics in black and red*. Palgrave Macmillan.
110. Purbrick, M. (2019). A report of the 2019 Hong Kong protests. *Asian Affairs*, 50(4), 465–487. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03068374.2019.1672397>
111. Qureshi, A. (2024). Decentralization and local governance in India: Assessing the Panchayati Raj system. *International Journal of Research and Analytical Reviews*, 11(2), 3980–3988. https://www.ijrar.org/viewfull.php?&p_id=IJRAR24B2980
112. Rahe, P. A. (2009). *Soft despotism, democracy's drift: Montesquieu, Rousseau, Tocqueville, and the modern prospect*. Yale University Press.
113. Rahman, M. T. (2023). *Decentralization and inclusive governance: A global perspective*. Palgrave Macmillan.
114. Reyes, D. D. R. (2016). Issues and problems in decentralization and local autonomy in the Philippines: A preliminary assessment. *Journal of Politics and Governance*, 6(1), 102–124. <https://www.jpogov.org/article/view/616102>
115. Rhodes, R. A. W. (1997). *Understanding governance: Policy networks, governance, reflexivity and accountability*. Open University Press.
116. Rondinelli, D. A. (1981). Government decentralization in comparative perspective: Theory and practice in developing countries. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 47(2), 133–145. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002085238104700205>
117. Roy, A. (2022). *Decentralization and development: A comparative perspective*. Routledge.
118. Rugeiyamu, R., & Msendo, A. (2025). Success, challenges and prospects of decentralization in Africa: A systematic review. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 11(1), 2458700. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2025.2458700>
119. Sahoo, S., Jha, S., Sarkar, S., & Halder, R. (2023). BLRS: An automated land records management system using blockchain technology. In *Applied Computing for Software and Smart Systems* (pp. 113–128). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-6791-7_7
120. Saito, Y., & Rose, J. A. (2023). Reputation-based decentralized autonomous organization for the non-profit sector. *Frontiers in Blockchain*, 5, Article 1083647. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fbloc.2022.1083647>
121. Sajeev, A., Anusree, J., & Anusree, V. S. (2025). Democratic decentralization in India: An analysis of the Panchayati Raj system. *VISTAS Law Review*, 9(1), 45–62.
122. Salovaara, P., Vuori, J., & Collinson, D. (2025). Leaderless leadership in radically decentralised organisations. *ResearchGate*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/380008457_Leaderless_leadership_in_radically_decentralised_organisations

123. SFU Library. (2020). *Citing Indigenous Elders & Knowledge Keepers: APA (7th ed.) citation guide*. <https://www.lib.sfu.ca/help/cite-write/citation-style-guides/apa/indigenous-elders-knowledge-keepers>
124. Shackleton, R. (1961). *Montesquieu: A critical biography*. Oxford University Press.
125. Shah, A. (Ed.). (2006). *Local governance in developing countries*. World Bank Publications. <https://doi.org/10.1596/978-0-8213-6565-6>
126. Smith, B. C., & Revell, L. (2016). *Decentralization: The territorial dimension of the state*. Routledge.
127. Smoke, P. (2015). Rethinking decentralization: Assessing challenges to a popular public sector reform. *Public Administration and Development*, 35(2), 97–112. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pad.1710>
128. Smoke, P., & White, R. (2005). *East Africa decentralization stocktaking study*. World Bank.
129. Sorce, G., & Dumitrica, D. (2022). Transnational dimensions in digital activism and protest. *Review of Communication*, 22(3), 157–174. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15358593.2022.2107877>
130. Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2007). *Theories of democratic network governance*. Palgrave Macmillan.
131. Steger, M. B., & Roy, R. K. (2010). *Neoliberalism: A very short introduction*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrade/9780199560516.003.0002>
132. Sustainability Directory. (2025, April 9). *Ethical frameworks for algorithmic DAO governance*. <https://prism.sustainability-directory.com/scenario/ethical-frameworks-for-algorithmic-dao-governance/>
133. Swann, T. (2015). *Anarchist cybernetics: Control and communication in radical left social movements* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Leicester). <https://s3.amazonaws.com/arena-attachments/641381/c1ed510ffcf4d6b48188760deadf059d.pdf>
134. Swann, T. (2021). *Anarchist cybernetics: Control and communication in radical politics*. Bristol University Press. <https://doi.org/10.46692/9781529208801>
135. Symer, N. (2023, April 14). *Occupy Wall Street: A deep dive into the movement that challenged the status quo*. CAS272N Blog. <https://sites.psu.edu/nsymercas272n/2023/04/14/occupy-wall-street-a-deep-dive-into-the-movement-that-challenged-the-status-quo/>
136. Tang, T. Y. (2022). The evolution of protest repertoires in Hong Kong: Violent tactics in the anti-extradition bill protests in 2019. *The China Quarterly*, 251, 660–682. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305741022000698>
137. Tocqueville, A. de. (2000). *Democracy in America* (H. C. Mansfield & D. Winthrop, Trans.). University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1835–1840)
138. Torrissi, G., Pike, A., & Tomaney, J. (2013). *Decentralisation and economic development in the OECD countries: A comparative perspective*. OECD Regional Development Working Papers. <https://doi.org/10.1787/5k49qgkzv5r8-en>
139. Treisman, D. (2007). *The architecture of government: Rethinking political decentralization*. Cambridge University Press.
140. Trends Wide. (2025, May 28). *The ethics of algorithmic decision-making in DAOs*. <https://trendswide.com/the-ethics-of-algorithmic-decision-making-in-daos/>
141. Van Gelder, S. (2011). *This changes everything: Occupy Wall Street and the 99% movement*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
142. von Wangenheim, G. (2020). Blockchain-based land registers: A law-and-economics perspective. In *Disruptive Technology, Legal Innovation, and the Future of Real Estate* (pp. 103–122). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-52387-9_6
143. Wager, S. J., & Schulz, D. E. (1995). Civil-military relations in Mexico: The Zapatista revolt and its implications. *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs*, 37(1), 1–42. <https://doi.org/10.2307/166215>
144. Waging Nonviolence. (2025, September). *A year later, Africa's Gen Z uprising is only more emboldened*. <https://wagingnonviolence.org/2025/09/africa-gen-z-uprising-year-later/>
145. Wampler, B., McNulty, S., & Touchton, M. (2021). *Participatory budgeting in global perspective*. Oxford University Press.
146. Wanyande, P., Kibara, G., & Kosure, J. (2021). *Deepening devolution and constitutionalism in Kenya*. Intergovernmental Relations Technical Committee. <https://www.irg.go.ke/publications/deepening-devolution>
147. Warren, M. E. (2001). *Democracy and association*. Princeton University Press.
148. Wekesa, A. N. (2025, June 24). *Gen Z protests: One year scorecard on Kenya's 2024 uprising*. *The Kenya Times*. <https://thekenyatimes.com/latest-kenya-times-news/scars-of-2024-highlights-of-gen-z-protests-how-kenyas-economy-suffered/>
149. Western, S. (2014a). Autonomist leadership in leaderless movements: Anarchists leading the way. *ephemera: theory & politics in organization*, 14(4), 673–698. https://ephemerajournal.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/contribution/14-4western_0.pdf
150. Western, S. (2014b). Autonomist leadership in leaderless movements: Anarchists leading the way. https://www.academia.edu/11240946/Autonomist_leadership_in_leaderless_movements_anarchists_leading_the_way
151. Williams, D. M. (2018). Contemporary anarchist and anarchistic movements. *Sociology Compass*, 12(e12582). <https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12582>
152. Wolfsfeld, G., Segev, E., & Sheaffer, T. (2013). Social media and the Arab Spring: Politics comes first. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 18(2), 115–137. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1940161212471716>
153. Woods, C. (2024, October 20). *How Occupy Wall Street changed activism*. Breaking Barriers. <https://blog.hcwoods.com/2024/10/20/how-occupy-wall-street-changed-activism/>

154. World Bank. (1997). *World development report 1997: The state in a changing world*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1596/0-19-521114-6>
155. World Bank. (2011). *Accountability in public services in South Africa*. World Bank. <https://doi.org/10.1596/978-0-8213-8458-6>
156. Wunsch, J. S. (2001). Decentralization, local governance and 'recentralization' in Africa. *Public Administration and Development*, 21(4), 277-288. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pad.185>
157. Wunsch, J. S., & Olowu, D. (2000). *The failure of the centralized state: Institutions and self-governance in Africa*. ICS Press.
158. Yilmaz, S. (2009). *Local government discretion and accountability: A diagnostic framework for local governance*. World Bank. <https://doi.org/10.1596/1813-9450-4967>
159. Zargham, M., & Nabben, K. (2023). Aligning 'Decentralized Autonomous Organization' to precedents in cybernetics. *MIT Computational Law Report*. <https://law.mit.edu/pub/dao-precedents-cybernetics>

