

## **Web3 and the State: Indian state's redescription of blockchain**

Debarun Sarkar\*, Independent Researcher, [debarun@outlook.com](mailto:debarun@outlook.com)

Cheshta Arora\*, Western Norway Research Institute, [car@vestforsk.no](mailto:car@vestforsk.no)

**Abstract:** The article does a close reading of a discussion paper by NITI Aayog and a strategy paper by the Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology (MeitY) advocating non-financial use cases of blockchain in India. By noting the discursive shift from transparency to trust that grounds these two documents and consequently Indian state's redescription of blockchain, the paper foregrounds how governance by infrastructure is at the heart of new forms of governance and how blockchain systems are being designated as decentral by states to have recentralizing effects. The papers highlight how a mapping of discursive shifts of notions such as trust, transparency, (de)centralization and (dis)intermediation can be a potent site to investigate redescriptions of emerging sociotechnical systems.

**Keywords:** blockchain, cryptocurrency, state, transparency, infrastructure, trust

\*Both authors have contributed equally to the research and development of this text.

### **I. Introduction:**

The way in which blockchain has captured the interest of the market in the last few years is being increasingly documented and critically analysed from different perspectives (Brekke, 2018; Herian, 2018; Jacobetty and Orton-Johnson, 2022). However, there is a skewed focus on mapping the "feverish interest of capitalists and entrepreneurs" dotting Silicon Valley in the global north with only limited work on mapping "less formal techno-financial experimentation" in the global south (Campbell-Verduyn and Giunelli, 2022) as well as how blockchain captures the imagination of other political actors. This skewed focus on capitalists and entrepreneurs, and blockchain's potential to

reinvent finance, obfuscates how another important actor<sup>1</sup>, the state, aims to redescribe blockchain. This occlusion is jarring considering that until 2018, at least 100 projects were underway in 30 countries "to transform government systems" (Jun, 2018).

At the time of writing, blockchain adoption and deployment in India ranged across a few use cases that involved using blockchain to store documents and certificates relating to birth, death, caste, land, judicial documents, and logistics.<sup>2</sup> Field-based studies of these new technologies are lacking with few exceptions. Discursive studies of the national policy documents are also missing.

This increasing interest of states in blockchain projects is attributed to blockchain's 'consensus mechanisms' that help decide if the public data is genuine which makes blockchain "an optimal technology for dealing with public data [...] with the potential to replace social organizations" (Jun, 2018). As an advanced "distributed ledger technology (DLT)... (blockchain) guarantees the integrity of data scattered across remote machines" (Jacobetty and Orton-Johnson, 2022). Its technical possibilities, however, do not satisfactorily explain "what leads countries to rapidly initiate blockchain projects?" (Jun, 2018) and how the technology itself is redescribed.

Blockchains are, at the very least, "socio-technical assemblages of human and non-human components" (Faustino, 2019) and an emerging site of "political contestation and possibility" (Gloerich *et al.*, 2018, p. 8). At the same time, anthropological view of the state foregrounds the state as a contested institutional form that comes into being through ideological and material aspects of everyday social practices, relations, actors, objects, technologies, and processes (Sharma and Gupta, 2006, p. 8). Given the contested and contingent nature of both blockchain as well as the state, it is worthwhile to unpack how the promise of blockchain is reworked when it is envisioned as state's infrastructure as well as how the state reinvents itself in light of the technology's alleged claims of disintermediation, decentralization and distribution.

---

<sup>1</sup>It should be noted that 'actor' is a shorthand for an assemblage of human and nonhuman processes that at times coagulate and attain a distinct identity. In this way, the state is both an actor and a network.

<sup>2</sup> See <https://blockchain.gov.in/>

Critical history of internet is ripe with political imaginaries of de/recentralization. These imaginaries range from "abstract claims about inherent political properties of internet protocols" to "social factors, institutional procedures and material aspects of internet infrastructure" (Beuster et al., 2022). Bodó et al. (2021) make a useful distinction between three characteristics of decentralization – 1) as a principle for design, 2) an end goal to have decentralizing effects, 3) a claim that designates a system as decentral. This distinction allows one to differentiate between blockchain experiments that "personify 'prefigurative politics' by design" with an "intention to embody the politics and power structure that they want to enable in society" (Husain et al., 2020) versus experiments that designate a system as decentral to have recentralizing effects.

In this paper, we focus on tracing discursively, the third aspect of decentralization and interrogate the ways in which a system is designated as decentralised but has recentralizing effects.

We offer a critical reading of two documents—*Blockchain: The India Strategy, Part I* published by the National Institution for Transforming India (NITI) Aayog in January 2020 and *National Strategy on Blockchain* published by Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology (MeitY), Government of India in January 2021. With these two texts, a constellation of other texts also appeared, *Tamil Nadu Blockchain Policy 2020* published by the Information Technology Department of the Government of Tamil Nadu, the draft of the Union government bill, *Banning of Cryptocurrency & Regulation of Official Digital Currency Bill, 2019* (Government of India, 2019) which has gone through revisions and backtracks over the years, and the Supreme Court judgement in *Internet and Mobile Association of India v. Reserve Bank of India* (2018). These other ancillary texts provide a sense of the emerging genealogy of the state's encounter with this new technological development, its efforts to comprehend, govern and domesticate it. However, we only focus on the two documents by the Niti Ayog and MeitY in this paper.

Methodologically, we borrow from critical policy studies literature that places an emphasis on treating state's documents as "ideologically constructed product of political forces" which "in spite of itself, embodies incoherences, distortions, structured omissions and negations" (Codd, 1988).

A critical analysis of state documents can foreground the ways in which “infrastructural control can serve as proxies to regain (or gain) control or manipulate the flow of money, information, and the marketplace of ideas in the digital sphere” (Musiani et al., 2016, p. 4). While states are being called upon to arrive at an overarching regulatory framework concerning blockchain and cryptocurrencies (Bains et al., 2022; Sarkar, 2022; Taylor, 2018), the paper makes opening moves to think through the foreclosures in state’s documents on blockchain.

The paper argues that blockchain is being redescribed by the Indian state to further disintermediation in the workings of the state—where the state gets rid of its own organs to centralize power. This rests on a discursive shift away from transparency to trust to blockchain as adjustably transparent—as is laid out in the analysis of the two texts in section 3. However, this political imagination of disintermediation falls short of rethinking new relationalities between the state and citizens that blockchain’s promise of decentralization and transparency could possibly enable.<sup>3</sup>

In the second section, we briefly trace the history of Indian state’s ambivalent response to blockchain and its attempt to disassociate blockchain from cryptocurrency. Through this section, we segue into the core section of the paper where we do a close reading of two texts to map the discursive shift from transparency to trust to adjustably transparent that’s at the core of Indian state’s redescription of Blockchain.

## **II. Indian state’s response to cryptocurrency and blockchain**

Cryptocurrency arose in response to the behaviour of centralized financial authorities that led to the 2008 crisis and “with the monopoly of central banks crumbling, the very definition of money [was] up for grabs” (Gloerich et al., 2018): what money is, how it is valued, who regulates it and assures its promissory value (Nakamoto, 2008).

This explicit financial use-case of blockchain technology was soon supplanted by more abstract notions of value introduced by the development of smart contracts in second-generation projects

---

<sup>3</sup>Technical limitations of decentralization still remain with the challenge of 51% attack for example (Kroll et al., 2013).

(Vigliotti, 2021). Smart contracts led to the possibility of executing what is referred to as decentralized finance and other forms of complex derivative transactions in a decentralized manner (Chen and Bellavitis, 2020).

This departure marked a moment in the development of blockchain technology wherein the ledger became more than a mere record of transactions (Savelyev, 2016; Hassan and De Filippi, 2017; De Filippi and Hassan, 2016). With second-generation projects like Ethereum, the code also became proof and law, recording complex contracts such as transfer of property, loans, mortgages, and the various complex derivatives and facilitating various decentralized applications from video games to social media (Wu, 2019). These technological developments made it possible to distinguish between financial use-cases of blockchain, such as cryptocurrencies, and non-financial use-cases of blockchain as DLT.

Like various other states in the world, the Indian state's response to cryptocurrency and non-financial use-cases of blockchain has not been the same. It's important to mark out the states' varied responses to these two aforementioned aspects of blockchain to underscore that state's use of blockchain rests on its redescription of blockchain as DLT while enacting certain erasures concerning its financial use-cases. This distinction between cryptocurrency and non-financial use-cases of blockchain is reflected in the manner in which different organs of the state have responded to the developments in blockchain and cryptocurrency. We give a brief account of these developments below.

### *The ban*

On April 5, 2018, the Reserve Bank of India made a press release which included a paragraph on cryptocurrencies referred to as virtual currencies (VC) and notified that "entities regulated by RBI shall not deal with or provide services to any individual or business entities dealing with or settling VCs" (Reserve Bank of India, 2018b).

The next day, on April 6, 2018, the Reserve Bank of India published a notification addressed to all banking and payments service providers for "maintaining accounts, registering, trading, settling, clearing, giving loans against virtual tokens, accepting them as collateral, opening accounts of exchanges dealing with them and transfer/receipt of money in

accounts relating to purchase/sale of" (Reserve Bank of India, 2018a) cryptocurrencies. This wasn't the first time that the RBI had published a circular about cryptocurrencies as the circular noted that "Reserve Bank has, repeatedly through its public notices on December 24, 2013, February 01, 2017, and December 05, 2017, cautioned users, holders and traders of virtual currencies, including Bitcoins, regarding various risks associated in dealing with such virtual currencies" (Reserve Bank of India, 2018a).

What was different from the previous notifications though was that this notification sanctioned what was essentially a banking blockade against the circulation of cryptocurrency. It cut off the exchange of fiat and cryptocurrencies by explicitly targeting the cryptocurrency trading exchanges. This would not mean though that cryptocurrency was suddenly not being traded by Indian citizens or that all exchanges were shut down. Instead, the trade moved to peer-to-peer transactions facilitated by various exchanges as escrows.

#### *The reversal*

RBI's ban was challenged by the Internet and Mobile Association of India as well as cryptocurrency exchange platforms. It took roughly two years for the ban to be overturned by the Supreme Court of India. The Supreme Court's judgement remains an insightful document to map different descriptions of crypto and DLT—as currency, commodity, stock, property, funds, digital representation of value, digital means of payment, digital cash, medium of exchange, universal money, crypto as source of financial, legal and security-related risks etc. The Supreme Court's judgement and different redescriptions of crypto being played out therein remains beyond the scope of the paper. The verdict didn't resolve these different descriptions but merely hinged on crypto exchange platforms' right to free trade enshrined in the Article 19(1)(g) of the constitution. RBI's circular had restricted the exchanges' access to banking services and was thus found to be in violation of Article 19(1)(g).

One significant distinction made by the petitioners which is relevant for our discussion is the distinction between cryptocurrency and blockchain. While laying their cards on the table, the petitioner had pointed out that "it is a paradox that blockchain technology is acceptable to RBI, but crypto currency is not" (Supreme Court of India, 2018, p. 36). The paradox was

rejected by the bench on the grounds that "there is nothing irrational about the acceptance of a technological advancement/innovation, but the rejection of a by-product of such innovation. There is nothing like a take it or leave it option" (Supreme Court of India, 2018, p. 138). While the ambiguity concerning cryptocurrencies and their legal status is retained in the judgement, blockchain as a technological advancement is acknowledged and affirmed *tout court*. This dislodging of cryptocurrency and blockchain is not just the erasure of the economic implications but also the political challenge that these advances herald.

The overturning of the RBI ban by the Supreme Court led to a renewed activity in the industries around cryptocurrency particularly with the re-opening of the exchanges which allowed for bank transfers between the exchanges and the banks with certain limitations. This was also followed by the increased visibility of the crypto exchanges in the mainstream media with advertisements splattered across various media and high-profile advertisement slots.

While this unfettered enthusiasm coincided with a bull market of cryptocurrencies following the COVID-19 lockdowns, contradictory signals from different organs of the state started to be sent to media houses. Accompanying these mixed signals was the impending fear of passing the *Banning of Cryptocurrency & Regulation of Official Digital Currency Bill, 2019* (Government of India, 2019). The draft of the bill which has been circulating for the last few years framed a direct ban but had not been tabled yet. Even the Supreme Court judgement noted the existence of the bill and the government's flip-flop on the issue as a sign of ambivalence.

But within this generalized atmosphere of fear and uncertainty, the banks started to cut off their payment networks and services with the cryptocurrency exchanges. This led to a notification by the RBI on May 31, 2021, which noted explicitly

"certain banks/ regulated entities have cautioned their customers against dealing in virtual currencies by making a reference to the RBI circular DBR.No.BP.BC.104/08.13.102/2017-18 dated April 06, 2018. Such references to the above circular by banks/ regulated entities are not in order as this circular was set aside by the Hon'ble Supreme Court on March 04, 2020 in the matter of Writ Petition (Civil) No.528 of 2018 (Internet and

Mobile Association of India v. Reserve Bank of India). As such, in view of the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the circular is no longer valid from the date of the Supreme Court judgement, and therefore cannot be cited or quoted from." (Reserve Bank of India, 2021)

As the Supreme Court noted in its judgement there has been a considerable amount of activity among various organs of the state in trying to comprehend and in turn consider the implications of the technological developments of cryptocurrency and blockchain. This has been accompanied by a burgeoning economy of start-ups in India ranging from cryptocurrency exchanges to organisations developing scaling solutions for Ethereum such as Polygon<sup>4</sup>.

Publication of strategies by various organisations of the state then remain texts that give a sense of how these new techno-economic shifts are being redescribed by different actors and through what manoeuvres. In the next section, we present an analysis of two documents that redescribe blockchain as a decentralized managerial technology of the state with recentralizing effects.

### **III. Case Studies**

#### *The NITI Aayog's Report*

National Institution for Transforming India (NITI) Aayog (lit. 'Policy Commission') is the apex policy think-tank of the Government of India. It was founded in 2015 and replaced Planning Commission, India's 64-year-old apex policy-making body. A comprehensive account of what this transition entailed in practice is still missing. Before its demise in 2015, the Planning Commission was central to independent India's political and economic visions and had already been at the centre of multiple critiques which we cannot discuss here. Briefly, at the time of its demise, it was already established that the commission had failed to realize the visions of the anti-colonial struggle and had displayed centralizing tendencies in its planning and functioning with an overbearing regulatory oversight.

---

<sup>4</sup>While the key founders of Polygon are Indian, the founders do not associate the company with any one national identity claiming that it's a "decentralized network with no headquarters" although it is officially registered in the British Virgin Islands (Mansur, 2022).



The demands and plans to restructure the Planning Commission were already underway and the NITI Aayog emerged amidst these contestations. The transition to NITI Aayog and its political and economic implications are still contested. In its own narrative, NITI Aayog sets itself against the established failures of Planning Commission. Its roles and responsibilities have been clubbed under four major heads: 1) fostering cooperative federalism, 2) formulating strategic vision and long-term policies and programme framework for the macro-economy and different sectors, 3) acting as a knowledge and innovation hub, and 4) providing a platform for interdepartmental coordination (Rao, 2015). However, sceptics have noted that NITI Aayog is not a shift away but a move towards further centralization. It increases the Union's control over states and results in further entrenchment of neoliberal policies at the Union level by incentivizing public-private policies and increasing inter-state competition to attract private capital (Patnaik, 2015). It is important to note that NITI Aayog has no constitutional power, and its reports and suggestions hold no executive power except as recommendations. Despite this, NITI Aayog's discursive production must be taken seriously because of its peculiar configuration (Patnaik, 2015) which makes it distinct from other publicly funded think tanks since it was a replacement of the Planning Commission.

This quick background to NITI Aayog is relevant to map how it frames the adoption of blockchain in India in the Part 1 of the discussion paper titled "Blockchain: The India Strategy - Towards Enabling Ease of Business, Ease of Living and Ease of Governance". It published the first part in January 2020 and the second part of the report was yet to be published at the time of writing and revising this paper in early 2024.

At the outset, the technology in the discussion paper is tied to the motto that has been central to the ruling party's governance approach in the last few decades: ease of collaboration for enterprise, ease of living for citizens. It is divided into six main chapters and envisioned to be a 'pre-read' to "implementing a blockchain system in India" because, as the Foreword warns, "the technology may not be universally more efficient and thus specific use cases need to be identified where it adds value and those where it does not" (NITI Aayog, 2020, p. 5).

The discussion paper doesn't shy away from emphasizing that the technology "has the potential to revolutionize interactions between governments, businesses and citizens in a manner that

was unfathomable just a decade ago" and "is unique in its foundation nature" with the "potential to unlock new sources of efficiency and value" (NITI Aayog, 2020, p. 6). Two main visions are identified vis-à-vis ease of business and ease of living that blockchain can help address: "'self-regulation' to ensure ease of doing business by allowing entities to interact through a *trusted medium* with a reduced dependency on cumbersome regulatory oversight and compliance" and "empowering citizens through features of *transparency, decentralization, and accountability...*" (NITI Aayog, 2020, p. 6 emphasis added).

Blockchain as a technology is explained in an Appendix at the end of the discussion paper. It is clear from the Introduction as well as the structure of the report that one of the primary challenges that the authors hoped to address via the discussion paper was to re-narrate blockchain as governance infrastructure. The Introduction acknowledges that blockchain doesn't lend itself as governance infrastructure easily and one of the tasks of the discussion paper is to "demystify and improve the understanding of amenability of blockchain to specific use-cases" and present the "functional view of blockchain" based on a simple decision-making framework developed in chapter 2 (NITI Aayog, 2020, p. 6) and to advocate its potential for governance.

NITI Aayog's redescription of the technology pivots upon two descriptive moves: First, it establishes blockchain as "the new trust paradigm". Second, it "removes transaction from the context of finance" and insists upon a meaning of transaction as it is "commonly defined" as "the act of carrying out or conducting a deal or exchange to a conclusion or settlement" (NITI Aayog, 2020, p. 9).

NITI Aayog's redescription of blockchain begins by evoking Friedman's reinterpretation of Leonard Read's essay "I, Pencil". Friedman is used as an authoritative citational source to introduce the "invisible hand of the market" which "makes something as simple as a pencil" (NITI Aayog, 2020, p. 8) possible. From Niti Aayog's point of view, this 'invisible hand of the market', however, is riddled with disputes and disagreements that need trusted intermediaries to "ensure that the entities adhere to the commonly understood 'rules of the game'" (NITI Aayog, 2020, p. 8). Traditionally, the paper notes, governments have performed this role of a mediator and ensured contract enforcement through mechanisms of deterrence and penalty but governments' role as a mediator is also burdened with inefficiencies. Thus, enter blockchain—a technology that

represents "an impartial and trusted facilitator", a code-based "trusted intermediary" with "the power to enforce rules" (NITI Aayog, 2020, p. 8).

In redescribing blockchain as a code-based intermediary to facilitate self-regulation, NITI Aayog doesn't envision that the state will recede back or outsource its function to its technological counterpart. Instead, this redescription is essential to introduce state back into the network as a 'player' (NITI Aayog, 2020, p. 14). After describing blockchain as a trust-based system, the authors note that the Indian state has been failing in its "processes to ensure trust" (NITI Aayog, 2020, p. 10) which the use of blockchain as trusted intermediary can help address by ensuring "less government and more governance"—which is the popular mantra underpinning the right-wing ruling government's policy approach since 2014.

It should be noted here that while blockchain is quite commonly presented as a new 'trust-based system', as the discussion paper too establishes, this description is contingent. For instance, the famous Bitcoin technical paper (Nakamoto, 2008), attributed to the pseudonym Satoshi Nakamoto, begins by acknowledging the "inherent weakness of the trust-based mode" underpinning all "commerce on the Internet" and through Bitcoin, envisions "an electronic payment system based on cryptographic proof instead of trust" (Nakamoto, 2008, p. 1).

The Bitcoin technical paper concerned itself with the problems of double spending—where the same single digital token can be spent more than once—in electronic payments system that made it necessary to have a trusted party overseeing the transaction. To address this, and to remove any reliance on a trust-based system, it relied on introducing absolute transparency into the system where "transactions must be publicly announced" (Nakamoto, 2008, p. 2) to avoid any reliance on a trusted third party.

On the contrary, NITI Aayog's redescription of blockchain as a trust-based intermediary—rather than, say, a transparent intermediary—is at the heart of redescribing blockchain as a governance infrastructure. Where in the Bitcoin paper, blockchain technology enabled a peer-peer transaction based on a transparent cryptographic proof instead of trust, in the NITI Aayog's redescription, blockchain technology involves simplifying the trusted systems by reintroducing a code-based trusted intermediary in the peer-peer transaction (which

otherwise has been eroded given the increasing complexity of the trust systems) (NITI Aayog, 2020, p. 9).

This is accompanied by another narrative move where the meaning of transaction is evocatively removed from "the context of finance" to its "commonly defined" notion as "the act of carrying out or conducting a deal or exchange to a conclusion or settlement" (NITI Aayog, 2020, p. 9) which are "facilitated by 'trust systems' and intermediaries" (NITI Aayog, 2020, p. 9).

On page 11, after establishing the narrative move laid out above, it finally asks, 'What is Blockchain?'. At this point in the narrative, NITI Aayog can confidently define blockchain as "a database, which is distributed, *adjustably* transparent, highly secure, and immutable" (NITI Aayog, 2020, p. 11 emphasis added).

With this definition, blockchain has been redescribed in the report as a governance technology. The most interesting bit in this definition is the qualifier "adjustably transparent" (as opposed to the absolute transparency underpinning the Bitcoin paper). The qualifier attests that in this vision of blockchain the records will be "made visible to *relevant stakeholder*". Thus, enter the State.

The discursive addition of the qualifier adjustably transparent brings back the state as the gatekeeper. Blockchain is a code-based intermediary accessible to relevant stakeholders only via the entry/exit rules defined by the state. Here, blockchain becomes a technology for the state to cut down the actors involved in the process. From Page 12-14, it presents the cost-effective and economic value of 'reducing intermediaries' and decentralization while adding that the "mechanism of decentralization or peer-peer exchange is a spectrum and not a binary concept" and decentralised infrastructure is not averse to regulation (NITI Aayog, 2020, p. 14).

It is via this caveat that it segues into two characteristics of DLT: "permissioned systems and permission-less systems" (NITI Aayog, 2020, p. 14) . Thereafter, a case is made to pay attention to "sectors of governmental intermediation where a state entity is involved just for ledger maintenance or collecting state dues but is not adding value to the transaction" to "assess how government's role can be defined in those sectors" (NITI Aayog, 2020, p. 14) . This scalar approach to look and get rid of its own organs "that do not add value"

becomes interesting in light of Gupta's (2006, p. 6) anthropological lens that describes "state as a multilayered, contradictory, translocal ensemble of institutions, practices, and people in a globalized context" that draws one's attention towards "interbureaucratic conflicts" (2006, p. 16) to underscore the porous and permeable nature of the state and its institutions which distributes power and creates space for layers of contestations. Moreover, the dismissal of permissionless or public blockchains further points towards the erasure of (pseudo)anonymous transparency that DLT could facilitate.

To sum up, in the use-case of Bitcoin, blockchain represented a move away from a trust-based system towards transparency, whereas in the NITI Aayog's redescription, blockchain is a move towards a code-based intermediary that allows the state to reorganize itself and re-enter as a trusted intermediary.

Having made this discursive shift from a) transparency to trust to blockchain as adjustably transparent, b) transaction as any exchange/deal (not just financial) between parties and blockchain as a database/record of that exchange, and c) from disintermediation to reduced intermediaries, the discussion paper goes on to describe its blockchain use-case selection framework. It presents a list of nine items to consider before settling on a blockchain-based solution. Of these nine, the foremost is the need to reduce intermediaries, and number 5 points the need for shared write access.

We point out number 5 to underscore the discussion paper's emphasis on shared write access as a necessary condition to adopt blockchain-based solutions as opposed to shared read access. Within its framing of reducing intermediaries, it suggests that if multiple actors do not require write-access on the ledger then blockchain is not the right fit. The question of read access is reduced herein to disintermediation and not opening up the ledger to the larger public. As a government infrastructure, transparency on blockchain will be a privileged access with the state returning as a centralized 'trusted party' that decides who gets the write and read access.

It will not resemble a citizen simply browsing the blockchain or having access to the information without going through a 'trusted intermediary', for example, the way one does on Etherscan to browse the transaction data of Ethereum.

The rest of the report narrates various trials and experiments that NITI Aayog has been pursuing with various other actors to determine the suitability of blockchain deployment in various state-led use cases. It ends with "Regulatory and policy considerations for evolving a vibrant blockchain ecosystem" such as "IndiaChain", establish "India as blockchain hub", "Procurement process for government agencies to adopt blockchain solutions", "Pegged stable coin for Indian Rupee" and the regulatory mechanisms around cryptocurrency and initial coin offerings (ICO) (NITI Aayog, 2020, p. 52).

The proposed second report's absence limits our current foresight into the possible configuration of the Indian state and its particular reconfiguration concerning cryptocurrency and blockchain. However, through a close reading of the first part, we have identified the discursive shift from transparency to trust to adjustable transparent that's at the heart of redescribing blockchain as governance infrastructure. Rather than decentralize, this discursive shift will have centralizing effects on the way the technology comes to be designed and deployed with the state returning as a gatekeeper.

If the transparency feature of blockchain was retained as it appears in the 2008 Bitcoin paper, one could have, for example, imagined a range of state processes, that already fall under the ambit of India's Right to Information Act, to be auditable by the citizens. Activist notions of auditing flourished since the 1950s (Vecchione *et al.*, 2021) which have had concrete effects on social movements and the state with provisions such as the Right to Information in India.

The origins of the Right to Information movement deserves a brief mention here to point out why this erasure is a significant one in a genealogical sense. The Right to Information as citizen-centric auditing of state processes began in a small village in Rajasthan with an initial demand for the panchayat (village governing body) to write their financial accounts on the blackboard outside the office (Roy and MKSS Collective, 2018) which could be read by anyone. This was a vision of a citizen-centric auditable ledger long before DLT.

However, such an imagination is foreclosed in the above discursive shift from transparency to trust to adjustably transparent which clears the space for the state to return as a centralized, trusted intermediary. One could argue that opening all ledgers to the public raises questions of privacy. The

report explicitly warns against "storing private/proprietary information" on blockchain and suggests that it is "best suited for transaction records". While all transaction records need not necessarily require disclosure to all citizens, the foreclosure of using blockchain for opening up state records as always already accessible information cannot be ignored.

### *MeitY's Report*

As noted previously, NITI Aayog is an advisory body to the Union government but has no constitutional power. On the other hand, Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology (MeitY) is a ministry of the Government of India formed in 2016 when it was separated from the Ministry of Communications and Information Technology. In effect, NITI Aayog is an advisory body whose documents wield advisory power, but a Ministry is a site of executive powers, whose reports wield sovereign legitimacy. This power shift has effects on the nature of the reports and their redescription of blockchain as well. While NITI Aayog makes narrative manoeuvres to delineate and redescribe the object under contestation, the ministry moves towards its stabilisation and legitimisation.

*National Strategy on Blockchain* was published in January 2021, a year after the NITI Aayog discussion paper, by the MeitY to "make India as one of the leading countries [to] harnessing" (Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, Government of India, 2021, p. 2) technology's benefits by focussing on both technological and administrative aspects of blockchain. While overlapping in scope with the NITI Aayog's report, MeitY's report is more straightforward in its tone than the discussion paper. It begins with an emphasis on developing "trusted digital platforms through shared Blockchain infrastructure...and facilitating state of the art, transparent, secure, and trusted digital service delivery to citizens and businesses" (Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, Government of India, 2021, p. 1). It is divided into 12 chapters over 43 pages to provide insight into strategies and recommendations for creating a trusted digital platform using Blockchain and MeitY's role therein. The document, written in a more matter-of-fact tone, doesn't deploy the rhetorical moves as explicitly as the discussion paper.

It begins by stating in a matter-of-fact manner that "Blockchain is an innovative distributed ledger technology...introduced in the design and development of cryptocurrency, Bitcoin in 2009 by

Satoshi Nakamoto...is an amalgamation of various innovations, with a clear business value...enables a shared ledger among the various parties involved in business transactions...acts as the single source of truth...and eliminates the need for a central entity to validate the transactions...can be used in both permissioned and permissionless models" (Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, Government of India, 2021, p. 2). Like the discussion paper, it presents blockchain as a technology that 'enables a layer of trust' and goes into its technical details at the outset. It reiterates the discursive shift noted in the discussion paper, where under the section on "value addition of the technology in e-governance domain", it states that "...Blockchain follows secure by design paradigm which makes it a unique system that makes business transactions transparent and trusted in a consortium environment" (Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, Government of India, 2021, p. 7). However, in its analysis of blockchain, it presents a wider use-case for blockchain in a range of domains ranging from cryptocurrencies, trade finance, legal, real estate, healthcare, supply chain, IT cloud storage, sharing economy, Internet of things, insurance, crowd-funding, and banking (Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, Government of India, 2021, p. 14) and goes on to identify international examples of blockchain-as-a-service in other regions such as China, Europe, Estonia, United Arab Emirates, US, Brazil, Chile, Canada, Singapore, Switzerland as well as initiatives in the private sectors led by Samsung, LG and Amazon before it goes on to describe the national initiatives.

This allows it to present a wider use case to describe blockchain as a service with economic and social value and remain open to "find new innovative use-cases based on blockchain" (Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, Government of India, 2021, p. 26). However, when read side-by-side with the NITI Aayog's discussion paper, one can identify the foreclosure underpinning this report. The new use cases are situated in the discursive shift that the NITI Aayog's discussion paper has already enacted. The matter-of-factness is, first and foremost, grounded in this discursive shift from transparency to trust.

Where NITI Aayog's report focuses on introducing and explaining the use cases of blockchain for the state and framing the potential of blockchain as an infrastructural intervention for disintermediation, MeitY's report is more concrete in its



visions and suggestions. As part of the technological aspects of blockchain, it begins at the outset by recommending a National Blockchain Infrastructure for hosting regulatory sandbox that can be used for building and deploying Blockchain applications. In addition to the discursive shift, this concreteness and the matter-of-fact tone is made possible via two other stabilization gestures.

The report begins by crediting Bitcoin to Satoshi Nakamoto, which is used in the report as a proper name, as an individual inventor of the technology. This matter-of-factness rests on a discourse of the technological prowess of great individuals in the narratives of technoscientific progression. Noting the presence of 'Czars' as an important feature in the postcolonial Indian technoscience narratives, Abraham (2017) noted that this practice "derives from the distinct notion of authorship...as well as the teleological imbrication of higher stages of modernization with technological achievement" (Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, Government of India, 2021, p. 2).

Unlike the discussion paper, which acknowledged the contingencies concerning blockchain technology and the need to redescribe it before it can be used as a governance infrastructure, the matter-of-fact attitude of MeitY's report erases the pseudonymity surrounding the name Satoshi Nakamoto (which can refer to one person or a group of persons) and the contingency around blockchain. The technology is stabilized by assigning it a distinct author, a proper name, and second by narrating it as part of the inevitable higher stages of modernization to come— that is, "an amalgamation of various innovations, with a clear business value" (Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, Government of India, 2021, p. 1).

Moreover, the report also emphasizes suggestions and feedback from public consultations that map the interest of various actors in the technology and the desire among different actors to steer it in the right direction covering aspects such as research and development, security and privacy, standards, legal and regulatory compliance, financial inclusion, education, awareness and skill building etc. A (techno)scientific fact or object is stabilized by enrolling new allies and assembling an authoritative interest (Latour, 1987) of different actors in blockchain technology as potential government infrastructure. Opening up blockchain technology to these other external aspects

ranging from legal compliance to skills and competence enacts a stabilizing gesture where blockchain emerges as a code-based trusted intermediary in service of the state.

## **Conclusion**

The two documents illustrate what's at the heart of the discursive manoeuvres to redescribe blockchain technology as a key government infrastructure. A critical look at how the organs of the state narrate blockchain allows one to perceive the conditions and imaginaries through which socio-technical systems are redescribed as the "state successfully represents itself as coherent and singular" (Sharma and Gupta, 2006, p. 10). The discussion paper by NITI Aayog enacts the discursive shift from transparency to trust to adjustably transparent that allows the state to enter as a trusted intermediary managing and regulating a permissioned blockchain model which is designated as decentralized but has centralizing effects with the state removing its organs that do not add value and deciding who has the read or write access. MeitY's report furthers this discursive shift and stabilizes blockchain technology as governance infrastructure through its matter-of-fact presentation of blockchain "as an amalgamation of various innovations" and how it has enrolled interests of a range of actors to develop it as a techno-managerial solution that can be leveraged to deliver state's necessary functions.

With the analysis of the above two documents, and by noting the structured omissions that give the documents their narrative coherence, the paper foregrounded how infrastructural control and governance by infrastructure are at the heart of new forms of governance. The question vis-à-vis blockchain is not whether it can become a well-regulated general-purpose technology underpinning state or market infrastructure but rather what does it become as processes of redescription continue. These de/recentralization tendencies are not unique to blockchain but form the core of distributed technologies which researchers should watch out for and critically interrogate.

## **About the authors:**

Debarun Sarkar is an independent researcher.

Cheshta Arora, PhD, is a senior researcher at the Western Norway Research Institute, Sogndal.

## **References**

- Itty Abraham, 2017. "From the Commission to the Mission Model: Technology Czars and the Indian Middle Class," *The Journal of Asian Studies*, volume 76, number 3, pp. 675–696.
- Parma Bains, Arif Ismail, Fabiana Melo and Nobuyasu Sugimoto, 2022. "Regulating the Crypto Ecosystem The Case of Unbacked Crypto Assets," at <https://www.imf.org/-/media/Files/Publications/FTN063/2022/English/FTNEA2022007.ashx>.
- Gerd Beuster, Oliver Leistert and Theo Röhle, 2022. "Protocol," *Internet Policy Review*, volume 11, number 1, at <https://policyreview.info/glossary/protocol>, accessed 20 July 2023.
- Balázs Bodó, Jaya Klara Brekke and Jaap-Henk Hoepman, 2021. "Decentralisation: a multidisciplinary perspective," *Internet Policy Review*, volume 10, number 2, at <https://policyreview.info/concepts/decentralisation>, accessed 20 July 2023.
- Jaya Klara Brekke, 2018. "Postcards from the World of Decentralized Money: A Story in Three Parts," In: I. Gloerich, G. Lovink and P. van der Burgt (editors). *Moneylab reader 2: Overcoming the hype*, INC reader, Amsterdam: Institute of Network Cultures, pp. 52–63, and at [networkcultures.org/publications](http://networkcultures.org/publications).
- Malcolm Campbell-Verduyn and Francesco Giumelli, 2022. "Enrolling into exclusion: African blockchain and decolonial ambitions in an evolving finance/security infrastructure," *Journal of Cultural Economy*, volume 15, number 4, pp. 524–543.
- Yan Chen and Cristiano Bellavitis, 2020. "Blockchain disruption and decentralized finance: The rise of decentralized business models," *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, volume 13, p. e00151.
- John A Codd, 1988. "The construction and deconstruction of educational policy documents," *Journal of Education Policy*, volume 3, number 3, pp. 235–247.
- Primavera De Filippi and Samer Hassan, 2016. "Blockchain technology as a regulatory technology: From code is law to law is code," *First Monday*, at <https://firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/7113>, accessed 14 June 2021.
- Rao, M. G. (2015). Role and Functions of NITI Aayog. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 50(4), 13–16. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24481536>
- Sandra Faustino, 2019. "How metaphors matter: an ethnography of blockchain-based re-descriptions of the world," *Journal of Cultural Economy*, volume 12, number 6, pp. 478–490.
- Inte Gloerich, Geert Lovink and Patricia de Vries, 2018. "Overcoming the Blockchain and Cybercurrency Hype: Introduction to MoneyLab Reader 2," In: *Moneylab reader 2: Overcoming the hype*, INC reader, Amsterdam: Institute of Network Cultures, pp. 7–13, and at [networkcultures.org/publications](http://networkcultures.org/publications).
- Government of India, 2019. *Banning of Cryptocurrency & Regulation of Official Digital Currency Bill, 2019*, Government of India.

- Samer Hassan and Primavera De Filippi, 2017. "The Expansion of Algorithmic Governance: From Code is Law to Law is Code," *Field Actions Science Reports. The journal of field actions*, number Special Issue 17, pp. 88–90.
- Robert Herian, 2018. : *Critical Perspectives in Law and Technology*, London: Routledge.
- Syed Omer Husain, Alex Franklin and Dirk Roep, 2020. "The political imaginaries of blockchain projects: discerning the expressions of an emerging ecosystem," *Sustainability Science*, volume 15, number 2, pp. 379–394.
- Pedro Jacobetty and Kate Orton-Johnson, 2022. "Blockchain Imaginaries and Their Metaphors: Organising Principles in Decentralised Digital Technologies," *Social Epistemology*, volume 0, number 0, pp. 1–14.
- MyungSan Jun, 2018. "Blockchain government - a next form of infrastructure for the twenty-first century," *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, volume 4, number 1, p. 7.
- Joshua A. Kroll, Ian C. Davey and E. Felten, 2013. "The Economics of Bitcoin Mining, or Bitcoin in the Presence of Adversaries," at <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/The-Economics-of-Bitcoin-Mining%2C-or-Bitcoin-in-the-Kroll-Davey/c55a6c95b869938b817ed3fe3ea482bc65a7206b>, accessed 21 July 2023.
- Bruno Latour, 1987. *Science in action: how to follow scientists and engineers through society*, Nachdr., Cambridge, Mass: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Rishabh Mansur, 2022. "[Exclusive] Polygon is not an Indian startup; we have no HQ: Co-founder Sandeep Nailwal after \$450M fundraise," *YourStory.com*, at <https://yourstory.com/the-decrypting-story/exclusive-polygon-sandeep-nailwal-investors-funding-sequoia-tiger-softbank>, accessed 21 July 2023.
- Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, Government of India, 2021. *National Strategy on Blockchain*, Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, Government of India.
- Francesca Musiani, Derrick L. Cogburn, Laura DeNardis and Nanette S. Levinson edsAA, 2016. *The Turn to Infrastructure in Internet Governance*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan US, at <http://link.springer.com/10.1057/9781137483591>, accessed 23 December 2022.
- Satoshi Nakamoto, 2008. "Bitcoin: A Peer-to-Peer Electronic Cash System," at <https://downloads.coindesk.com/research/whitepapers/bitcoin.pdf>.
- NITI Aayog, 2020. *Blockchain: The India Strategy Part I*, NITI Aayog.
- Prabhat Patnaik, 2015. "From the Planning Commission to the NITI Aayog," *Economic and Political Weekly*, volume 50, number 4, pp. 10–12.
- Reserve Bank of India, 2021. "Customer Due Diligence for transactions in Virtual Currencies (VC)," at <https://rbidocs.rbi.org.in/rdocs/notification/PDFs/45VIRTUALCURRENCIES37FE644EF97F4A36AAB951C73A411E96.PDF>.

- Reserve Bank of India, 2018a. "Prohibition on dealing in Virtual Currencies (VCs)," at <https://rbidocs.rbi.org.in/rdocs/notification/PDFs/NOTI15465B741A10B0E45E896C62A9C83AB938F.PDF>.
- Reserve Bank of India, 2018b. "Statement on Developmental and Regulatory Policies," at <https://rbidocs.rbi.org.in/rdocs/PressRelease/PDFs/PR264270719E5CB28249D7BCE07C5B3196C904.PDF>.
- Aruna Roy and MKSS Collective, 2018. *The RTI Story: Power to the People*, Roli Books Private Limited.
- Gargi Sarkar, 2022. "Blockchain Technology Transcends Boundaries, Need Global Regulations: RBI Governor," *Inc42 Media*, at <https://inc42.com/buzz/blockchain-technology-transcends-boundaries-need-global-regulations-rbi-governor/>, accessed 23 December 2022.
- Alexander Savelyev, 2016. "Contract Law 2.0: «Smart» Contracts as the Beginning of the End of Classic Contract Law," *Working Paper, National Research University Higher School of Economics*.
- Aradhna Sharma and Akhil Gupta edsAA, 2006. *The Anthropology of the State A Reader*, Australia: Blackwell Publishing, at <http://voidnetwork.gr/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/The-Antropology-of-the-State-edited-by-Aradhana-Sharma-and-Akhil-Gupta.pdf>, accessed 12 July 2018.
- Supreme Court of India, 2018. *Internet and Mobile Association of India v Reserve Bank of India*, at [https://main.sci.gov.in/supremecourt/2018/19230/19230\\_2018\\_4\\_1501\\_21151\\_Judgement\\_04-Mar-2020.pdf](https://main.sci.gov.in/supremecourt/2018/19230/19230_2018_4_1501_21151_Judgement_04-Mar-2020.pdf).
- Marshall Taylor, 2018. "How Blockchain Needs Regulation to Mature," *CoinCentral*, at <https://coincentral.com/how-blockchain-needs-regulation-to-mature/>, accessed 23 December 2022.
- Briana Vecchione, Karen Levy and Solon Barocas, 2021. "Algorithmic Auditing and Social Justice: Lessons from the History of Audit Studies," In: *Equity and Access in Algorithms, Mechanisms, and Optimization*, -- NY USA: ACM, pp. 1–9, and at <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3465416.3483294>, accessed 8 March 2023.
- Maria G. Vigliotti, 2021. "What Do We Mean by Smart Contracts? Open Challenges in Smart Contracts," *Frontiers in Blockchain*, volume 3, at <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fbloc.2020.553671/full>, accessed 14 June 2021.
- Kaidong Wu, 2019. "An Empirical Study of Blockchain-based Decentralized Applications," *arXiv:1902.04969 [cs]*, at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1902.04969>, accessed 14 June 2021.