MO-11 Village democracy under strong or weak states: China, Indonesia, India

Village self-government, when analyzed across deep time and varying political geographies, rarely exists as a pristine, sovereign entity. In the modern era, village democracy operates almost exclusively in the shadow of an overarching state architecture. The devolution of power to the village level—whether through formal elections, participatory budgeting, or traditional assemblies—presents a fundamental principal-agent problem for the central state. Autocracies and flawed democracies alike face an inherent tension: delegating power to local communities harnesses localized information to improve public goods and satisfy citizens, but it inherently weakens the central government's vertical control over the periphery.

This comprehensive research report evaluates the mechanics, durability, and vulnerabilities of village democracy within larger state structures. Through rigorous analysis of rural governance structures in China, Vietnam, Indonesia, India, Afghanistan, and Botswana, the following sections deconstruct how local democratic institutions function as tools of statecraft, how they are consistently targeted and captured by individuals exhibiting dark-triad traits (narcissism, Machiavellianism, psychopathy), and at which specific demographic scales they succeed, fail, or remain untried. The objective is to distill these historical and empirical realities into foundational principles for governing human populations following the permanent loss of industrial supply chains and state reach.

China: The Calculus of Autocratic Decentralisation

The introduction of local elections in rural China stands as one of the largest democratic experiments in human history, encompassing approximately 600,000 villages and governing the lives of nearly one billion individuals[1]. The Chinese Communist Party (CCP) formalized village elections through the Organic Law of Villagers' Committees, which was initially enacted on an experimental basis in 1987 and permanently codified in 1998[2].

The primary catalyst for this democratic concession was not an ideological shift toward liberalism, but an acute deficit in state bureaucratic capacity. In the 1980s, following the dismantling of the agricultural communes, the central government struggled to monitor local officials effectively. Appointed village cadres frequently failed to provide necessary local public goods, such as irrigation ditches and primary schools, while simultaneously employing brutal tactics to aggressively enforce highly unpopular central mandates, including the one-child policy and heavy agricultural taxation[2]. The resulting rural discontent threatened regime stability. By introducing local elections, the autocrat delegated the monitoring of local officials to the villagers themselves. Villagers possess an absolute informational advantage regarding both local needs and the daily actions of the village head[2].

Rigorous empirical analysis by Monica Martinez-Bravo, Gerard Padró i Miquel, Nancy Qian, and Yang Yao (2022) in their work "The Rise and Fall of Local Elections in China" demonstrates that the introduction of elections shifted the policy matrix precisely as the organizational model of autocratic delegation predicts[1]. Utilizing a novel dataset spanning almost four decades, the

researchers tracked policy outcomes and de facto power dynamics. They found that the introduction of elections significantly improved the implementation of popular policies. Specifically, investments in transportation infrastructure increased by 32% (from $6.51 billion to $8.58 billion in constant 2015 US dollars), and investments in agricultural infrastructure surged by a staggering 166% (from $12.39 billion to $31.63 billion)[4]. Furthermore, elections reduced the average age of Village Committee members, indicating a genuine turnover of entrenched elites rather than mere performative voting[4].

However, this delegation carried a severe cost for the central state: elected village officials facing constituents had little incentive to implement unpopular policies mandated by the upper government[1]. As the Chinese state's fiscal and bureaucratic capacity grew exponentially—evidenced by a massive surge in regional government revenues from $14.38 billion to $110.16 billion—the autocrat no longer needed to rely on the costly mechanism of citizen delegation for local monitoring[4]. The central state now possessed the resources to deploy top-down auditing, enhanced organizational capital, and technological surveillance. Consequently, beginning in the early 2000s, the regime actively recentralised power. It systematically subordinated the elected Village Committee to the centrally appointed Village Party Secretary, functionally eroding village autonomy and reverting to absolute vertical control[2].

Interpretative Perspectives: China's Village Elections	**Detail & Evidence**
What locals said it did	Villagers viewed the introduction of elections in the late 1980s and 1990s as a genuine opportunity to remove corrupt, incompetent cadres and secure necessary infrastructure investments that the state was failing to provide[2].
What the record shows	Archival, fiscal, and statistical records confirm a temporary but highly significant surge in village-level public goods provision, alongside a corresponding decrease in the age and entrenchment of village officials[4].
What modern scholarship infers	Scholars infer that local elections were an organizational stopgap, never intended as a stepping stone to liberal democracy. As state capacity increased, the informational utility of the elections was outweighed by the cost of losing vertical control, prompting deliberate and systematic recentralisation[1].

Scale Ledger: Chinese Organic Law of Villagers' Committees	Status & Reasoning
Household (4 to 10)	*Untried.* The state interfaces with the household via the village head; the household is not a formal democratic unit in this framework.
Hamlet or band (30 to 50)	*Worked (Informally).* Kinship networks at this scale operated effectively to influence the larger village vote through informal bloc formation.
Village (150 to 500)	*Worked (Temporarily).* Allowed for near-perfect information asymmetry; villagers easily monitored the elected head's daily actions before the state reasserted control[2].
Parish or district (1,500 to 5,000)	*Worked (Temporarily).* Many Chinese administrative villages reach this demographic size. The arrangement successfully executed large-scale public works before state recentralisation[4].
Town or watershed (15,000 to 50,000)	*Failed.* Elections were strictly contained below the township level to prevent the formation of organized regional opposition against the CCP[2].
Region (0.5 - 5M) / Nation (50M+) / Planet (8B)	*Never Tried.* The CCP explicitly barred any horizontal linkage between villages to maintain absolute vertical dominance and prevent alternative power centers.

Capture Test: China's Village Democracy	Mechanisms and Historical Cases
Dark-Triad Capture Mechanism	Psychopathic and highly Machiavellian actors often organized into local mafias,

	known as *hei'e shili* (black and evil forces), utilizing organized violence and intimidation to secure the chairmanship and extract illicit rents from land sales[6]. Alternatively, Machiavellian actors bypassed the electorate entirely by currying favour with higher-level township governments to be appointed as the Village Party Secretary, functionally overriding the elected chairman.
Historical Case of Capture / Resistance	The most prominent case of resistance to capture occurred during the 2011 Wukan protests in Guangdong province, where villagers expelled corrupt officials over illegal land grabs and briefly secured free elections, elevating Lin Zulian to the village chief position[7].
Reversal of Capture	The resistance was ultimately crushed when the higher state apparatus reasserted dominance. The state arrested Lin Zulian on corruption charges in 2016, proving that local democratic resistance cannot survive an overriding, hostile state apparatus[7].

Vietnam: Grassroots Democracy as Crisis Management

Vietnam's approach to village governance mirrors China's organizational calculus but was forged in the immediate crucible of direct rural rebellion. In 1997, massive unrest erupted in the northern province of Thai Binh, where up to 48,000 farmers mobilized against egregious corruption, land grabbing, and severe abuse of power by local party secretaries and people's committee chairmen[8]. The protesters blockaded towns, clashing directly with authorities and highlighting a severe crisis of legitimacy for the Communist Party of Vietnam (CPV).

In direct response to the Thai Binh uprising, the state issued Decree 29/1998, famously known as the Grassroots Democracy (GRD) decree, which later evolved into a 2007 National Assembly Standing Committee Ordinance and culminated in the 2022 Law on Implementation of Democracy at Grassroots Level[13]. The GRD policy was theoretically constructed on the guiding slogan "people know, people discuss, people do, and people verify" (Dân biết, dân bàn, dân làm, dân kiểm tra)[13]. It legally mandated transparency in local budgets, infrastructure projects, and land allocations, ostensibly transferring monitoring and oversight power to the rural populace[13].

However, political scientist Hai Hong Nguyen (2016), in his exhaustive work *Political Dynamics of Grassroots Democracy in Vietnam*, demonstrates that the implementation of GRD was fundamentally a top-down mechanism designed to restore CPV legitimacy and prevent future mass mobilizations[17]. While the legislation provides a legal framework for citizens to inspect and supervise local governance, it simultaneously outlaws independent, politically active civil society organizations. As democratic space theoretically opened at the village level, the state aggressively cracked down on horizontal political organization. Pro-democracy advocates who attempted to use grassroots platforms to push for broader political transformation, such as the 118 individuals who signed the Manifesto on Freedom and Democracy for Vietnam on April 8, 2006 (known as Bloc 8406), were swiftly designated as terrorists or reactionaries[13]. The state suppressed these movements through a combination of police action and highly sophisticated anti-protest propaganda, utilizing national television to brand protesters as violent "extremists" and "social disrupters" to deter public support[9].

Interpretative Perspectives: Vietnam's Grassroots Democracy	**Detail & Evidence**
What locals said it did	Citizens reported marginal improvements in administrative transparency and a reduction in petty corruption at the commune level. However, survey data indicates a sequential causal relationship where the "people are informed" level is high, but the "people inspect and supervise" level remains structurally restricted[14].
What the record shows	The enactment of the GRD laws strongly correlates with a decrease in large-scale rural uprisings comparable to the 1997 Thai Binh incident. The state successfully utilized the mechanism to isolate localized grievances and prevent contagion[10].
What modern scholarship infers	Scholars infer that the GRD is a highly effective pressure-release valve. It functions as an instrument of authoritarian resilience rather than democratization, utilizing localized transparency to maintain macroeconomic stability and absolute single-party dominance[17].

Scale Ledger: Vietnamese Grassroots Democracy (GRD)	Status & Reasoning
Household (4 to 10)	*Worked (as consultation).* The state actively interfaces with households via "phát phiếu lấy ý kiến" (distributing feedback forms), using the household as the primary unit of data collection[16].
Hamlet or band (30 to 50)	*Worked.* Functioned effectively as a venue for localized grievance airing, preventing the escalation of disputes.
Village (150 to 500)	*Worked (for implementation).* The law mandates public meetings for community consensus on micro-infrastructure, which successfully executes small-scale projects[16].
Parish or district (1,500 to 5,000)	*Failed / Subverted.* Operated formally at the commune level (cấp xã) where budgets are supposedly disclosed, but actual structural power and candidate selection remain entirely monopolized by the local party block.
Town or watershed (15,000 to 50,000)	*Failed.* Grassroots democracy principles are highly diluted at the district/town level, where state bureaucratic opacity takes over entirely.
Region (0.5 - 5M) / Nation (50M+) / Planet (8B)	*Never Tried.* The CPV strictly forbids horizontal coalition building across provinces, viewing any regional organization as an existential threat to the state[13].

Capture Test: Vietnam's Grassroots Democracy	Mechanisms and Historical Cases

Dark-Triad Capture Mechanism	A Machiavellian local cadre easily captures the Vietnamese GRD structure by adhering strictly to the *letter* of the law while violating its *spirit*. Because the party maintains a monopoly on candidate selection and meeting agendas, a dark-triad actor engineers consent by holding mandated town halls but packing them with loyalists and suppressing dissent through social coercion and economic threats[17].
Historical Case of Capture / Resistance	Throughout the 2000s, local party secretaries repeatedly utilized the GRD framework to legitimize illegal land seizures for personal profit, relying on the state's anti-protest propaganda to delegitimize any villagers who attempted to resist[12].
Reversal of Capture	Capture is occasionally reversed only when a cadre's extraction becomes so egregious and highly visible that it threatens the central party's legitimacy, prompting the higher state tier to purge the official to maintain the regime's image. Internal village resistance is rarely sufficient.

Indonesia: Fiscal Decentralisation and Elite Capture

Indonesia's 2014 Village Law (Law No. 6/2014) represents one of the most aggressive fiscal decentralisation strategies implemented in the developing world. Designed to empower rural autonomy and stimulate local economic growth, the law legally mandated the *Dana Desa* (Village Fund), transferring at least 10% of the national state budget directly to the country's 74,954 villages[21]. Between the program's inception in 2015 and 2018, an unprecedented Rp 186 trillion flowed directly into rural administrative accounts[22].

However, infusing massive capital into weak local institutions predictably triggered widespread elite capture. The sheer volume of the *Dana Desa* rapidly overwhelmed the administrative and technical capacity of village heads (*Kepala Desa*). The Indonesian Corruption Watch (ICW) identified systemic vulnerabilities that were immediately exploited: a severe lack of transparency, the creation of fictitious projects, massive mark-ups on materials, and deep collusion between the Village Head and the Village Consultative Body (BPD) meant to oversee them[22]. The resulting epidemic of graft led to hundreds of village heads being subjected to sting operations (OTT) by the national anti-corruption agency (KPK). The KPK noted 601 cases of village fund misappropriation between 2012 and the late 2010s, with losses amounting to tens

of billions of Rupiah[22].

The underlying mechanics of this catastrophic failure in participatory democracy were presaged precisely by Benjamin Olken's (2007) landmark randomized field experiment in Indonesia, published in the *Journal of Political Economy*[25]. Studying 608 villages across 156 subdistricts engaged in infrastructure projects, Olken rigorously tested whether grassroots participation or top-down auditing was more effective at curbing corruption. His findings were definitive: increasing grassroots participation in accountability meetings had virtually no average impact on reducing missing expenditures[26]. The barrier was the classic free-rider problem: individual villagers bore the severe social, political, and time costs of monitoring the *Kepala Desa*, but the benefits of reduced corruption were diffuse across the entire population. Furthermore, local elites effortlessly dominated the accountability meetings, neutralizing dissent. Conversely, Olken found that increasing the probability of a central government audit from 4% to 100% reduced missing expenditures—measured meticulously by discrepancies between official project costs and an independent engineer's estimate—by a highly significant 8 percentage points[26].

Interpretative Perspectives: Indonesia's Village Law	**Detail & Evidence**
What locals said it did	Villagers reported visible improvements in basic rural infrastructure (such as roads and village halls) but expressed profound alienation from the budgeting process. They widely recognized that funds were heavily monopolized by the *Kepala Desa* and their immediate cronies[21].
What the record shows	Financial records and KPK interventions demonstrate a massive spike in localized graft, characterized by extreme nepotism, fictitious expenditures, and a failure to allocate funds toward human resource development[22].
What modern scholarship infers	Scholarship, heavily anchored by Olken (2007) and Mansuri and Rao (2013), infers that participatory democracy without robust institutional capacity and rigorous, top-down enforcement merely democratizes corruption, shifting rent-seeking behaviors from national elites to village elites[26].

Scale Ledger: Indonesia's Dana Desa	Status & Reasoning
Household & Hamlet (4 to 50)	*Failed.* Citizens at this micro-scale entirely lacked the political leverage, accounting expertise, and technical literacy to audit complex engineering budgets[22].
Village (150 to 500)	*Worked (partially).* Functioned adequately for basic project selection (e.g., deciding where a road goes), but failed completely at financial accountability due to the free-rider problem observed by Olken[26].
Parish or district (1,500 to 5,000)	*Failed / Captured.* Operated as the primary administrative unit of the *Dana Desa*. This tier proved highly prone to capture by the Village Head and local suppliers operating in tandem[22].
Town, Region, Nation	*Worked (as external monitor).* State-level institutions (like the KPK) operating at the national level proved to be the only effective mechanism to audit the lower tiers, demonstrating that external vertical monitoring is an absolute requirement[28].

Capture Test: Indonesia's Village Democracy	Mechanisms and Historical Cases
Dark-Triad Capture Mechanism	Indonesian village democracy is highly susceptible to capture by narcissistic and Machiavellian actors who utilize kinship networks to establish "Dinasti KKN" (Corruption, Collusion, and Nepotism dynasties)[28]. A psychopath operating as a *Kepala Desa* captures the system by explicitly colluding with the BPD and manipulating the *SisKeuDes* (Village Financial System) software, exploiting the low technical literacy of other villagers[22].

Historical Case of Capture / Resistance	Numerous documented cases show *Kepala Desa* extracting fees from material suppliers and generating fictitious travel and project budgets, often defended by a traditional cultural norm of giving "thank you" money to leaders[22].
Reversal of Capture	Capture was only reversed when the central state's apex predator—the KPK—bypassed local dynamics entirely and executed sudden sting operations (OTT). Internal democratic resistance was wholly insufficient against entrenched kinship mafias[28].

India: Mandated Representation and Proxy Capture

India's Panchayati Raj system, permanently institutionalised by the 73rd Constitutional Amendment, established the *Gram Sabha* (village assembly) as a foundational unit of rural democracy. Uniquely among developing nations, the Indian state explicitly recognized that traditional village assemblies inherently marginalize women and lower castes. To combat this structural inequality, the state mandated that one-third of all *Pradhan* (chief) positions in village councils (*Gram Panchayats*) be randomly reserved for women, alongside specific proportional reservations for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes[32].

Raghabendra Chattopadhyay and Esther Duflo's (2004) landmark empirical analysis, "Women as Policy Makers: Evidence from a Randomized Policy Experiment in India," published in *Econometrica*, rigorously quantified the impact of this exogenous shock to local democracy[32]. Studying 265 village councils in the Birbhum district of West Bengal and in Rajasthan, the authors proved that the demographic identity and personal preferences of a leader deeply and quantifiably influence democratic outputs. In unreserved councils, only 6.5% of *Pradhans* were female; in reserved councils, it was 100%[32]. The study found that in villages with female *Pradhans*, investments in public goods shifted dramatically toward the expressed priorities of rural women. Specifically, female leaders invested up to 60% more in drinking water infrastructure and roads, while male leaders prioritized education and alternative public works[32]. Furthermore, the mere presence of a female leader increased the overall political participation of women in the *Gram Samsad* (village assembly meetings) from 6.9% to 9.9%[32].

However, the Indian context also birthed a unique and highly resilient manifestation of democratic capture: the *Sarpanch Pati* (husband of the Sarpanch) or *Mukhiya Pati* phenomenon. Because many women elevated to power lacked prior political experience, financial independence, or faced severe patriarchal constraints (such as the observance of *Purdah* in Rajasthan), their husbands functionally usurped the office[34]. The *Sarpanch Pati* acts as the de facto leader: he takes the oath, attends the meetings, negotiates with contractors, and

controls the finances, rendering the legally elected woman a mere proxy[38].

Interpretative Perspectives: India's Gram Sabha & Quotas	Detail & Evidence
What locals said it did	Marginalized groups (women and lower castes) acknowledged a tangible increase in relevant public goods (such as water access). However, many villagers openly viewed the female *Pradhan* as a mere figurehead for her husband, acknowledging the reality of proxy rule[34].
What the record shows	Statistical records conclusively show a highly significant shift in budget allocations aligning with gender-specific policy preferences, proving that the identity of the executive changes material outcomes even in patriarchal settings[32].
What modern scholarship infers	Scholarship infers that mandated representation successfully bypasses the initial barrier of entry and alters macroeconomic outcomes, but institutional engineering alone cannot immediately dismantle the deep socio-economic dependencies that facilitate proxy governance[34].

Scale Ledger: India's Panchayati Raj System	Status & Reasoning
Household (4 to 10)	*Failed.* Intra-household patriarchy and economic dependency directly undermined the village-level democratic mandate, weaponizing the household unit to create the *Sarpanch Pati* proxy[36].
Hamlet or band (30 to 50)	*Worked.* Operated as highly effective voting blocs heavily influenced by entrenched

	caste (*jati*) networks.
Village (150 to 500)	*Worked.* The *Gram Sabha* functions as a direct democratic forum where resource allocation preferences are actively voiced, showing increased participation when leadership demographics change[32].
Parish or district (1,500 to 5,000)	*Worked.* Operated as the *Gram Panchayat* level, effectively handling significant budgets for local infrastructure and public works[32].
Town, Region, Nation	*Worked (as enforcer).* State-level and national machinery are strictly required to enforce the reservation quotas, ensuring the local system does not legally revert to traditional exclusion[41].

Capture Test: India's Village Democracy	**Mechanisms and Historical Cases**
Dark-Triad Capture Mechanism	The *Gram Panchayat* under the reservation system provides a masterclass in Machiavellian capture. A local patriarch, legally barred from running due to gender or caste quotas, fields his wife or a financially dependent lower-caste individual as a puppet candidate. Operating in the shadows, this Machiavellian actor leverages existing patronage networks, wins the election, and physically occupies the administrative space[36].
Historical Case of Capture / Resistance	The *Sarpanch Pati* culture is endemic across rural India, subverting the legal mechanism without technically breaking the electoral rules[38].
Reversal of Capture	Reversing this proxy capture has proven exceedingly difficult. It relies on long-term educational shifts, NGO capacity-building

	for female leaders, and occasional strict enforcement by state Election Commissions penalizing proxy representation[36].

Peripheral Cases: Afghanistan and Botswana

Afghanistan: The National Solidarity Programme

In post-2001 Afghanistan, the central state (heavily backed by international military and financial donors) attempted to engineer village democracy through the National Solidarity Programme (NSP). A randomized field experiment conducted by Beath, Christia, and Enikolopov (2013) evaluated the creation of democratically elected development councils across rural villages[43]. These councils were tasked with managing vital resources, specifically the equitable distribution of 1,100 kg of food aid (wheat) per village[43].

The study found that formalizing democratic councils slightly improved the equitable distribution of resources compared to the traditional, unelected *malik* (headman) systems. However, this exogenous democratic injection was structurally fragile. It required constant external funding and military security to function. Because the institutional framework lacked deep historical roots and organic enforcement mechanisms, the democratic councils collapsed entirely once the overarching state apparatus and international backers withdrew, immediately reverting to traditional warlordism and autocratic tribal control.

Botswana: The Kgotla and Authoritarian Liberalism

Botswana is frequently lauded as an "African Miracle" by institutional economists, most notably Acemoglu and Robinson. They argue that the country's pre-colonial village assembly, the *Kgotla*, provided a heritage of good institutions and property rights that checked the absolute power of the *Kgosi* (chief)[44]. In 1968, the post-colonial state passed the Tribal Land Act, transferring land allocation rights from the chiefs to modern land boards, a move theoretically designed to modernize the *Kgotla's* democratic function and promote equitable development[45]. However, political scientist Kenneth Good rigorously deconstructs this optimistic narrative, classifying Botswana's governance model as "authoritarian liberalism"[47]. Good argues that the *Kgotla* was never a genuine democracy; rather, it was a highly managed forum for elite consensus. Historically, only free men could speak, and the agenda was tightly controlled by wealthy cattle barons and the royal elite (specifically the Khama dynasty)[44]. The post-colonial state preserved the *Kgotla* not to empower the grassroots, but to maintain a facade of consultation while executing a top-down, capitalist growth model that generated severe, systemic income inequality[50]. When the elite consensus is challenged, the state frequently utilizes severe measures, including deportation and restrictions on academic freedom—as experienced by Good himself—to suppress dissent[47]. The *Kgotla*, therefore, serves as a sophisticated mechanism for the elite to gauge the popularity of their policies and manage public relations without actually ceding sovereign decision-making power to the populace.

Scale Ledger & Capture Test: Peripheral Cases	Afghanistan (NSP) & Botswana (Kgotla)
Scale Efficacy	**Afghanistan:** Worked temporarily at the Village scale (150-500) only while subsidized by massive external military and financial aid. **Botswana:** Worked at the Village and Parish scales (150-5,000) strictly as a consultative body, failing completely to operate as a sovereign democratic legislature[43].
Capture Mechanisms	**Afghanistan:** Captured via direct kinetic violence by local warlords once state security evaporated. **Botswana:** Captured through structural elite dominance; Machiavellian elites utilize the *Kgotla* to manufacture consent, maintaining strict control over the agenda and suppressing dissenting voices through state-sanctioned force[47].

The Strongest Case Against Village Democracy

The most robust theoretical and empirical case against the uncritical promotion of village democracy is synthesized in the World Bank's seminal report *Localizing Development: Does Participation Work?* authored by Ghazala Mansuri and Vijayendra Rao (2013)[29]. Their exhaustive analysis, supported by the data of Olken (2007) and Martinez-Bravo et al. (2022), systematically dismantles the "romance of the local."

The core critique is that decentralising power to the village level does not eradicate hierarchy; it merely localizes it. Villages are not egalitarian utopias waiting to be liberated; they are highly stratified micro-societies defined by deeply entrenched inequalities of caste, wealth, and gender[29]. When a weak central state withdraws and transfers resources to the village, local elites—who possess the time, literacy, and social capital—invariably capture those resources[22]. The free-rider problem, as demonstrated by Olken, guarantees that ordinary, impoverished citizens will not sustain the high costs of continuous civic monitoring required to keep leaders honest[26]. Therefore, "civil society" at the village level is often a myth, and participatory democracy becomes a highly efficient tool for local oligarchs to legitimize their extraction under the guise of popular mandate.

The primary critics named in this discourse are:

1. **Ghazala Mansuri and Vijayendra Rao:** Argue that participation inherently fails without a strong, capable central state to audit local elites and enforce equity.

2. **Benjamin Olken:** Proved empirically that horizontal grassroots monitoring is vastly inferior to vertical state auditing in preventing financial corruption.
3. **Kenneth Good:** Demonstrated that traditional local assemblies are inherently elitist and serve to manufacture consent for authoritarian regimes.

Note on Fallacies: This analysis explicitly rejects the naturalistic fallacy and the romance of the primitive. There is no historical, ethnographical, or empirical evidence to suggest that older forms of tribal governance were inherently more just, nor does a smaller demographic scale guarantee fairness. Small communities can be intensely tyrannical, utilizing social ostracization, economic embargoes, and physical violence to enforce conformity far more efficiently than a distant bureaucracy.

10-Line Summary of Robust Findings

1. Autocrats introduce village elections primarily to solve principal-agent problems and overcome weak bureaucratic capacity, not out of ideological commitment to democratization.
2. Local elections effectively improve the provision of popular public goods (e.g., water, roads) because villagers possess superior, localized information regarding community needs.
3. Delegating power to the village inherently destroys the state's vertical control over unpopular mandates, leading to deliberate recentralisation as state capacity inevitably grows.
4. Unregulated fiscal transfers to villages (e.g., Indonesia's *Dana Desa*) reliably trigger massive elite capture, nepotism, and localized corruption.
5. Horizontal grassroots monitoring is highly vulnerable to the free-rider problem and is vastly inferior to top-down external audits in preventing graft.
6. Identity-based quotas (e.g., India's women reservations) successfully alter macroeconomic investments toward the specific policy preferences of the marginalized group.
7. Local patriarchal and kinship networks subvert formal legal frameworks through proxy rule, utilizing dependent actors to maintain control (e.g., the *Sarpanch Pati*).
8. Traditional village assemblies (e.g., Botswana's *Kgotla*) function predominantly as elite-managed consensus mechanisms rather than egalitarian democracies.
9. State actors routinely deploy "grassroots democracy" decrees as psychological pressure-release valves to pacify uprisings while retaining absolute structural dominance.
10. A strong, external auditing mechanism, capable of projecting coercive force, is an absolute prerequisite for village democracy to function equitably.

Contested or Open Questions

- **The Threshold of State Capacity:** At exactly what quantifiable level of fiscal and bureaucratic capacity does a state transition from needing local elections (for information gathering) to viewing them as a liability (due to loss of control)?
- **Digital Disintermediation:** Can blockchain or decentralized digital ledgers permanently solve the free-rider problem of local auditing without relying on a strong central state to

enforce compliance?

- **Cultural Determinism vs. Institutional Design:** To what extent can exogenous institutional engineering (like strict gender quotas) override deep-seated cultural hierarchies (like caste or strict patriarchy) over a multi-generational timeline?
- **The Post-State Vacuum:** If the overarching state collapses entirely, will villages inevitably default to elite capture and warlordism, or can horizontal federations of villages replicate the auditing function of a lost central state?

5 to 10 Sources to Read in Full

1. Martinez-Bravo, M., Padró i Miquel, G., Qian, N., & Yao, Y. (2022). "The Rise and Fall of Local Elections in China." *American Economic Review*, 112(9).
2. Olken, B. A. (2007). "Monitoring Corruption: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Indonesia." *Journal of Political Economy*, 115(2).
3. Chattopadhyay, R., & Duflo, E. (2004). "Women as Policy Makers: Evidence from a Randomized Policy Experiment in India." *Econometrica*, 72(5).
4. Mansuri, G., & Rao, V. (2013). *Localizing Development: Does Participation Work?* World Bank Policy Research Report.
5. Hai Hong Nguyen. (2016). *Political Dynamics of Grassroots Democracy in Vietnam*. Palgrave Macmillan.
6. Good, K. (1996). "Authoritarian Liberalism: A Defining Characteristic of Botswana." *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 14(1).
7. Beath, A., Christia, F., & Enikolopov, R. (2013). "Do Elected Councils Improve Governance? Experimental Evidence on Local Institutions in Afghanistan." *MIT Political Science Department*.

Implementability after the Fall

Minimum Viable Version (No State, No Grid, No Internet):

- **Household (4-10):** Patriarchal or matriarchal absolute rule tempered solely by survival dependency. Governance relies entirely on familial bonds; democratic mechanisms are non-viable at this scale.
- **Village (300):** A direct assembly (*Gram Sabha* / *Kgotla* equivalent) convening monthly. Decision-making requires physical presence. Crucially, executive leadership for specific projects should be selected via sortition (random lottery) rather than voting to prevent immediate elite capture by charismatic or Machiavellian actors.
- **District (3,000):** A federated council consisting of immediately recallable delegates sent from the 10 constituent villages, tasked solely with inter-village dispute resolution and resource trade.

What it needs to start:

Basic literacy among at least 10% of the population, a physical, tamper-proof paper ledger for public goods accounting, a universally agreed-upon lunar/solar calendar to mandate assembly days, and a central, physically protected meeting space capable of holding 300 people safely.

First failure to expect:

The immediate emergence of a *hei'e shili* (mafia) or *Kepala Desa* analog. A charismatic

psychopath or Machiavellian family will attempt to monopolize the physical ledger and the physical security force of the village, turning the assembly into a rubber-stamp exercise. Without an external "higher state" to audit them, the village will rapidly regress into localized feudalism unless the populace is heavily armed and willing to enact immediate kinetic violence against would-be oligarchs.

Principles

- **The Information Principle:** The delegation of power to the local level is inversely proportional to the central authority's ability to acquire accurate local information.
- **The Audit Principle:** Horizontal civic participation consistently fails to prevent corruption without the threat of vertical, external auditing.
- **The Proxy Principle:** Deeply entrenched social and cultural hierarchies will systematically bypass formal institutional rules through the use of proxies (e.g., the *Sarpanch Pati*).
- **The Capture Principle:** Infusing unchecked material resources into localized democratic structures inevitably results in immediate capture by Machiavellian elites.
- **The Preference Principle:** The demographic identity of the elected leader directly and quantifiably alters the macroeconomic allocation of public goods.

Works cited

1. The Rise and Fall of Local Elections in China: Theory and Empirical, https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w24032/w24032.pdf
2. The Rise and Fall of Local Elections in China, https://fass.nus.edu.sg/ecs/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2021/06/Vdem_20200831.pdf
3. The Rise and Fall of Local Elections in China - Googleapis.com, https://storage.googleapis.com/production-sitebuilder-v1-0-1/741/319741/PkwWoHa4/9e45285dc1e941f8af78c76bdd15e482?fileName=Vdem_FINAL_20220616.pdf
4. The Rise and Fall of Local Elections in China, https://cowles.yale.edu/sites/default/files/2022-12/p1808.pdf
5. The Rise and Fall of Local Elections in China, https://pubs.aeaweb.org/doi/10.1257/aer.20181249
6. Path to Democracy? Assessing Village Elections in China, https://polisci.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/people/u3854/JoCC2009.pdf
7. Party head in Wukan village investigated - Headlines ... - Ecns.cn, http://www.ecns.cn/2016/06-19/214821.shtml
8. Political Accountability, State Capacity, and Authoritarian Resilience, https://openaccess.wgtn.ac.nz/ndownloader/files/38161227
9. How Authoritarian Anti-Protest Propaganda Works, https://epublications.marquette.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1154&context=polisci_fac
10. The Inhibiting Effect of Social Media on Rural Social Movements, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/368086159_Connected_Countryside_Th

e_Inhibiting_Effect_of_Social_Media_on_Rural_Social_Movements
11. Interpreting the Constitutional Debate Over Land Ownership in the, https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/asian-journal-of-comparative-law/article/interpreting-the-constitutional-debate-over-land-ownership-in-the-socialist-republic-of-vietnam-20122013/2309E2CB32E6508EE7C23560F9E57A00
12. Civil Society and Governance in Vietnam's One Party System, https://espace.library.uq.edu.au/view/UQ:361973/s4240705_phd_submission.pdf
13. Vietnam and the Challenge of Political Civil Society - Project MUSE, https://muse.jhu.edu/article/265199
14. DEMOCRATIC PARTICIPATION OF CITIZENS IN THE NEW RURAL, https://www.researchpublish.com/upload/book/DEMOCRATIC%20PARTICIPATION%20OF%20CITIZENS-14102025-1.pdf
15. Law on Implementation of grassroots-level democracy of Vietnam, https://vnlawfirm.vn/van-ban/law-on-implementation-of-grassroots-level-democracy-of-vietnam-2022/
16. Luật Thực hiện dân chủ ở cơ sở 2022 số 10/2022/QH15, https://thuvienphapluat.vn/van-ban/Quyen-dan-su/Luat-Thuc-hien-dan-chu-o-co-so-nam-2022-546085.aspx
17. Political dynamics of grassroots democracy in Vietnam 978-1-137, https://dokumen.pub/political-dynamics-of-grassroots-democracy-in-vietnam-978-1-137-57776-4-1137577762-978-1-137-58088-7.html
18. Understanding the Political Dynamics of Grassroots Democracy in, https://espace.library.uq.edu.au/view/UQ:352936/s4256640_phd_thesissubmission.pdf
19. (PDF) A Warning from Above: How Authoritarian Anti-Protest, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/358547266_A_warning_from_above_How_authoritarian_anti-protest_propaganda_works
20. (PDF) Resilience of the Communist Party of Vietnam's Authoritarian, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/308095687_Resilience_of_the_Communist_Party_of_Vietnam's_Authoritarian_Regime_since_Doi_Moi
21. (PDF) Village fund and Indonesia rural development - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/386047927_Village_fund_and_Indonesia_rural_development_Rethinking_institutional_capacity_and_governance
22. Ini 16 Penyebab Korupsi Dana Desa hingga Merugikan Rp40,6 M, https://nasional.sindonews.com/berita/1356284/13/ini-16-penyebab-korupsi-dana-desa-hingga-merugikan-rp406-m
23. Satu Dekade Dana Desa: Janji Pembangunan yang Terkikis, https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2024/09/04/11243001/satu-dekade-dana-desa-janji-pembangunan-yang-terkikis-korupsi-dan-birokrasi?page=all
24. KEPEMIMPINAN KEPALA DAERAH DAN PRAKTIK KORUPSI DI RIAU, https://ipssj.com/index.php/ojs/article/download/799/734/2527
25. Reconciling design-based and model-based causal inferences for, https://arxiv.org/pdf/2105.01184
26. Monitoring Corruption: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Indonesia, https://users.nber.org/~rdehejia/!@$devo/Lecture%2011b%20Corruption/Olken_co

rruptionexperiments.pdf
27. Village Governance, Community Life, and the 2014 Village Law in, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/296627892_Village_Governance_Community_Life_and_the_2014_Village_Law_in_Indonesia
28. Jejak Dinasti KKN: Ketika Kerabat Pejabat Ikut Terlibat Korupsi, https://tirto.id/jejak-dinasti-kkn-ketika-kerabat-pejabat-ikut-terlibat-korupsi-hDWK
29. Localizing Development: Does Participation Work? - World Bank, https://www.worldbank.org/en/research/publication/localizing-development-does-participation-work
30. Mansuri, Ghazala and Rao, Vijayendra: Localizing development, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/271923757_Mansuri_Ghazala_and_Rao_Vijayendra_Localizing_development_Does_participation_work
31. Al-Kharaj: Jurnal Ekonomi, Keuangan & Bisnis Syariah, https://journal-laaroiba.com/ojs/index.php/alkharaj/article/download/222/553
32. Women as Policy Makers: Evidence from a India-Wide Randomized, https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w8615/w8615.pdf
33. Women as Policy Makers: Evidence from a India-Wide Randomized, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/4816063_Women_as_Policy_Makers_Evidence_from_a_India-Wide_Randomized_Policy_Experiment
34. WOMEN AS POLICY MAKERS: EVIDENCE FROM A RANDOMIZED, https://economics.mit.edu/sites/default/files/2022-08/Women%20as%20Policy%20Makers%20Evidence%20from%20a%20Randomized.pdf
35. Women in Political Bodies as Policymakers - IZA@LISER Network, https://docs.iza.org/dp15983.pdf
36. Classroom Study Material - Vision IAS, https://cdn.visionias.in/value_added_material/b4c95-pt_365_polity_and_governance.pdf
37. Monthly Current Affairs April 2024 - Plutus IAS, https://plutusias.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/Magazine-Plutus-IAS-April.pdf
38. 0d69a-social-justice.pdf - Vision IAS, https://cdn.visionias.in/value_added_material/0d69a-social-justice.pdf
39. UNPACKING PARTICIPATORY DEMOCRACY - McGill University, https://www.mcgill.ca/isid/files/isid/channels/attach/unpacking_participatory_democracy_final_report.pdf
40. Solved Sociology PYQ UPSC Mains - Sleepy Classes IAS, https://sleepyclasses.com/sociology-pyqs-for-upsc-mains/
41. Monthly Current Affairs - Drishti IAS, https://www.drishtiias.com/images/pdf/Saraansh%20May%202027.pdf
42. February Issue; 2025 - NEXT IAS, https://www.nextias.com/newuploads/Nextias/2025/3/upsc-february-2025-the-crux-current-affairs-monthly-magazine-pdf-1742275437818.pdf
43. Do Elected Councils Improve Governance Outcomes? Experimental, https://haas.berkeley.edu/wp-content/uploads/archive/Enikolopov.pdf
44. (PDF) Cattle, diamonds and institutions: Main drivers of botswana's, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/260531855_Cattle_diamonds_and_instit

utions_Main_drivers_of_botswana's_economic_development_1850_to_present
45. An Assessment of the Evolution of the Public Sector in Botswana, https://ubrisa.ub.bw/jspui/bitstream/10311/2285/1/Motshegwa%2C%20B..pdf
46. Volume 17, Issue 1 March 2017 - African Studies Quarterly, https://asq.africa.ufl.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/168/v17i1_edit.pdf
47. Academic freedom in Botswana and the deportation of Kenneth Good, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/232936125_The_limits_of_the_'African_Miracle'_Academic_freedom_in_Botswana_and_the_deportation_of_Kenneth_Good
48. ASSESSING THE QUALITY OF GOVERNANCE IN BOTSWANA, https://elibrary.acbfpact.org/cgi-bin/acbf?a=p&p=redirect&acbfurl=HASH01ba/0750a9b5/56668a86/42d9.dir/fine%20balance.pdf&acbfurltitle=A+Fine+Balance%3A+Assessing+the+Quality+of+Governance+in+Botswana%2E
49. A Comparative Study of Democracy in Nigeria and Botswana, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/346215345_'The_Giant_of_Africa'_and_'Africa's_Success_Story'_A_Comparative_Study_of_Democracy_in_Nigeria_and_Botswana
50. COPYRIGHT AND CITATION CONSIDERATIONS FOR THIS, https://ujcontent.uj.ac.za/view/pdfCoverPage?instCode=27UOJ_INST&filePid=136256920007691&download=true
51. Interpreting the Exceptionality of Botswana | The Journal of Modern, https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/journal-of-modern-african-studies/article/interpreting-the-exceptionality-of-botswana/1F6FC12627046BFC7DA85CAE4B47122A
52. Civil-Military Relations in Botswana's Developmental State, https://journals.flvc.org/ASQ/article/download/136423/140984/263067