

# The Pursuit of True Decentralization in Social Media so far Failed Attempts

by LV \_\_ lv2015@proton.me <https://lv2015atproton.github.io>

## **\*\*Abstract\*\***

Despite the proliferation of blockchain technologies and decentralization, social media platforms remain predominantly centralized. Even projects that assert decentralization often retain backend control structures, moderation systems, or foundational leadership that influence narratives and content flow. A truly decentralized social media platform must be governed by its users, with censorship, promotion, and content filtering emerging from consensus rather than central authority. This paper delves into the fundamental principles of decentralized governance in social media, the challenges of implementation, and the philosophical framework necessary for constructing a platform devoid of top-down control.

## **\*\*Introduction: Centralized Control in Disguise\*\***

Social media governance today is predominantly controlled by algorithms, corporations, and moderators—centralized entities wielding significant influence over speech, reach, and digital identity. While some platforms profess decentralization, they often fall short of the ideal: they may be open-source or employ blockchain technology, but governance structures remain embedded within the founding team or a foundation that retains final authority.

True decentralization transcends mere technical architecture; it represents a philosophical paradigm shift in the governance of online communities.

## **\*\*2. What Is True Decentralization?\*\***

A decentralized social media platform must adhere to the following criteria:

- **Absence of Central Authority:** No single entity should possess the power to moderate, promote, or suppress content.
- **User-Governed Filtering:** Users must have complete control over the content they encounter or engage with. Morality and social norms should be user-defined and self-enforced through opt-in or opt-out community consensus mechanisms.
- **Blockchain Governance:** Censorship, promotion, and reputation mechanisms should be determined through smart contracts and on-chain voting.

**\*\*Self-Regulation Through Community:\*\*** Harmful or unwanted content should be filtered out not through top-down moderation, but through user choice and democratic tools such as staking, voting, and flagging.

In essence, decentralized social media should resemble a blank page—unwritten by any higher power, waiting for the collective voice of its users to shape its norms.

## **\*\*The Myth of Decentralized Moderation:\*\***

Existing platforms fail to meet this standard for several reasons:

\* **\*\*Founders' Control:\*\*** Even decentralized autonomous organizations (DAOs) often structure token allocations and privileges so that founding teams retain disproportionate influence.

\* **\*\*Backend Gatekeeping:\*\*** Critical infrastructure—node operation, API access, identity services—frequently remains under centralized control.

\* **\*\*Censorship Resistance vs. Lawlessness:\*\*** The tension between unfiltered expression and legal/ethical obligations drives many projects back to centralized moderation under pressure.

These shortcomings reveal a fundamental truth: decentralization is challenging because it demands that creators relinquish complete control.

#### **\*\*A Personal Lesson: Why Project X Failed:\*\***

In 2015, I launched **Project X Open Source**, a platform that loudly proclaimed decentralization. However, behind the open-source facade, I retained veto power over content, users, and feature rollouts. Despite public code, the platform was centralized at its core—because I was still the ultimate authority.

This contradiction eroded my integrity. I realized that a “decentralized” project I controlled was not truly decentralized. Consequently, I shut it down, not for technical failure, but for ethical failure.

Over time, I comprehended the true essence: a decentralized platform is **not** something you own; it is something you **release**. As the creator, your role is that of a facilitator. Once the code is on the blockchain, the platform becomes its own organism; you are merely another node operator and user.

#### **\*\*Governance by the People: A Framework for Decentralized Social Media:\*\***

To achieve genuine decentralization, governance must originate from the community:

- 1. Reputation-Weighted Staking:** Users accumulate reputation through sustained engagement. Smart contracts enable them to stake tokens to cast votes on protocol modifications, content filtering policies, or network upgrades.
- 2. Customizable, User-Defined Filters:** Instead of universal bans, each user establishes personal filters—muting topics, blocking users, and shaping their content feed without imposing these choices on others.
- 3. Forkable, Portable Identity:** Profiles and social graphs reside on-chain and can be replicated. If governance deviates or culture deteriorates, users can collectively migrate to a new instance—ensuring the protocol remains accountable to its participants.

This bottom-up architecture mirrors living systems, where rules and norms emerge organically through consensus rather than enforcement.

## 6. The Philosophical Challenge: Control vs. Freedom

Decentralization necessitates faith in collective intelligence and the courage to relinquish control:

- **Chaos Before Order:** Without a central moderator, disputes and forks may proliferate. However, this friction is essential for genuine self-organization.
- **Creators as Caretakers:** Founders must relinquish their vision of perfect design. Their role is to initiate the system and then step aside.

Founders must continually ask: *Are we constructing tools for individuals or systems that control them?* Only by surrendering authority can the ecosystem reflect the preferences of its users rather than the ambitions of its creators.

## 7. The Absence of Founders and Investors

A fundamental principle of true decentralization is that **there can be no founders or investors:**

- **Ownership Begets Power:** Any entity holding equity, tokens, or treasury control inherently wields disproportionate influence. Property rights directly translate into governance rights—recentralizing power.
- **Misaligned Incentives:**  
Investors prioritize returns, leading to protocol upgrades, content moderation standards, and community values being influenced by financial considerations rather than collective consensus.

**\*\*Hierarchical Governance:\*\*** Even token-voting models fail when early backers accumulate significant stakes. Their voting power can override community proposals, negating the decentralization sought.

**\*\*The Creator's Paradox:\*\*** Creators must launch the network without retaining special privileges, such as an emergency “kill switch,” privileged upgrade rights, or reserved token allocations. This ensures they become indistinguishable from other participants.

**\*\*Key Principle:\*\*** *Decentralization is not a funding strategy; it is an existential commitment. As long as any party retains residual ownership, the network retains a centralized spirit.*

**\*\*Conclusion: The Stateless Creation of a Decentralized Social Media Platform\*\***

A genuinely decentralized social media platform is akin to a blank page—it lacks imposed morality, appointed enforcers, or proprietary interests.

**\*\*Decentralized Governance:\*\*** All decisions are made through on-chain voting and reputation-weighted consensus.

**\*\*User Sovereignty:\*\*** Content curation is personal, allowing users to shape their own experiences.

**\*\*No Proprietary Control:\*\*** There are no founders' tokens, investor allocations, or centralized treasury.

Building this requires a profound leap of faith: **relinquishing control**. Founders initiate the ecosystem and then become mere operators among equals. The protocol's success depends on its merits and the collective will of its participants. Only then can social media truly become the open canvas we envision—an arena crafted entirely from the grassroots.