ME-03 Consensus and consent compared: Quakers, sociocracy, Holacracy, Robert's Rules

The total collapse of industrial supply chains and the permanent retreat of state infrastructure necessitates the reconstitution of governance architectures from the ground up, beginning at the household and scaling outward to the bioregion. This foundation document evaluates the historical and contemporary viability of structural decision-making methodologies. It rigorously avoids the naturalistic fallacy—the cognitive bias assuming that older, indigenous, or smaller-scale models are inherently more equitable or effective. Across deep time, governance architectures have consistently faced the threat of capture by actors exhibiting dark-triad traits (narcissism, Machiavellianism, psychopathy). By analyzing the Quaker business method, Sociocracy, Holacracy, Robert's Rules of Order, the Occupy general assembly, Zapatista *Juntas*, Rojava's Democratic Confederalism, and the Swiss Landsgemeinde, this report isolates the empirical realities of self-governance. For each arrangement, this document sharply distinguishes between the idealized claims of practitioners, the empirical historical record, and the retrospective inferences drawn by modern scholarship.

The Quaker Business Method: Discerning the "Sense of the Meeting"

Originating in the mid-17th century, the Quaker business method is one of the oldest continuously practiced alternatives to majority voting, persisting for over 370 years. The method is entirely voteless, governed instead by a presiding "Clerk."

Practitioner doctrine claims that the method is not consensus in the secular sense, but rather a collective spiritual discernment aimed at uncovering the "sense of the meeting," guided by divine light[1]. According to standard Quaker accounts, spoken contributions are framed by silence and presented as ministry rather than advocacy, requiring participants to listen rather than contend[1]. The historical record demonstrates that this method successfully sustained a highly cohesive transnational network of Friends who effectively governed property, disciplined members, and pioneered early abolitionist policies—such as the 1817 Gradual Manumission Act influenced by Elias Hicks[3].

However, modern scholarship infers a vastly different underlying mechanism. Michael Sheeran's 1983 study, *Beyond Majority Rule*, and Ben Pink Dandelion's sociological analyses of Quaker "double culture" argue that unity is often achieved not through divine consensus, but through a rigid, conformist behavioral creed[2]. Scholars observe a deeply entrenched "culture of aversion from conflict," where relational preservation is privileged above objective outcomes[4].

Capture Test The Quaker business method is structurally vulnerable to authoritarian capture by the Clerk, as well as obstructionist capture by narcissistic individuals. Because the method relies on conflict avoidance, a narcissist can hold the meeting hostage by refusing to stand

aside, knowing the group will rarely force a decision over vocal opposition[4]. Historically, Machiavellian capture occurred during the catastrophic 1827 Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, which triggered the Hicksite-Orthodox schism. Clerk Samuel Bettle, an orthodox evangelical partisan, recognized that the rural Hicksite reformers held a numerical majority. Refusing to yield, Bettle unilaterally declared that the orthodox minority constituted the "solid part" of the meeting, thereby dictating the meeting's minute and fracturing the Society of Friends until their eventual reunification in 1955[5].

Strongest Case Against The strongest case against the method is presented by Sheeran (1983) and Dandelion (2004), who argue that the methodology systematically enforces a stifling conformity and masks deep-seated ideological conflict, rendering it incapable of functioning outside a highly homogenous cultural matrix[1].

Scale Rung	Population	Viability and Historical Efficacy	Failure Modes and Limiting Factors
Household	4–10	Highly functional	Relies on intimate social ties and a shared cultural baseline.
Hamlet/Band	30–50	Highly functional	Social pressure effectively mandates compromise.
Village	150–500	Functional but slow	Processing speed drops significantly; factionalism begins to form.
Parish/District	1,500–5,000	Historical limit (Yearly Meetings)	Prone to catastrophic schism (e.g., 1827) due to diverse economic and theological lines[5].
Town/Watershed	15,000–50,000	Never attempted	Impossible to discern "unity" among tens of thousands without

			severe coercion.
Region/Bioregion	0.5M–5M	Untried	Structurally incompatible with macroscopic diversity.
Nation/Continent	50M–500M	Untried	Structurally incompatible.
Planet	8 Billion	Untried	Structurally incompatible.

Sociocracy and Sociocracy 3.0: Circular Governance

Developed in the 1970s by electrical engineer Gerard Endenburg, classical sociocracy sought to operationalize the pacifist educational philosophies of Kees Boeke from the 1940s[9]. Practitioners, heavily guided by standard texts from Buck and Villines (2007) and Rau and Koch-Gonzalez (2018), claim sociocracy creates an egalitarian, circular hierarchy based on four strict principles: consent governs decision-making (decisions stand unless there is a reasoned, paramount objection), circles are the basic governance unit, double-linking connects circles via a leader and a delegate, and elections are conducted by consent[9]. The historical record from Endenburg Elektrotechniek confirms operational efficacy during high-stakes crises. For instance, facing a sudden shipyard shutdown requiring 60 layoffs, a frontline worker's proposal to shift surplus labor into marketing was rapidly elevated through double-linked circles. It received consent from the top board, averting mass layoffs and diversifying the firm's client base[12].

Modern scholarship, led by A.G.L. Romme (1995, 1999), verifies that these structures successfully promote two-way information flow and mitigate formal domination[11]. However, the release of Sociocracy 3.0 (S3) in 2015 by Bernhard Bockelbrink, James Priest, and Liliana David unbundled the rigid classical system into over 70 modular patterns under a Creative Commons license[9]. This allowed organizations to adopt "consent" without adopting the full circular architecture[9].

Capture Test Sociocracy is vulnerable to Machiavellian capture through the weaponization of the "paramount objection." Because objections must be reasoned and logically tied to the circle's aim, a highly articulate, rule-lawyering narcissist can consistently formulate objections that paralyze proposals[11]. This shifts informal power to those with the highest rhetorical skill and stamina for debate. In S3, the modularity itself is a vector for capture: a psychopathic executive can adopt the vocabulary of "consent" while deliberately omitting "double-linking" and "financial transparency," maintaining a top-down autocracy cloaked in horizontal branding[9].

Strongest Case Against The strongest structural critiques come from Romme (1999) and

Pölderl (2023), who note that while sociocracy neutralizes formal hierarchical domination, it routinely fails to account for informal power dynamics—specifically inequalities in rhetorical ability, charisma, and institutional tenure, which silently re-establish dominance hierarchies[11].

Scale Rung	Population	Viability and Historical Efficacy	Failure Modes and Limiting Factors
Household	4–10	Functional	Highly effective for distributing household labor and strategic aims.
Hamlet/Band	30–50	Optimal	The 5–7 person circle matrix is optimal for consent processing[11].
Village	150–500	Highly functional	Double-linking easily handles coordination across multiple working groups.
Parish/District	1,500–5,000	Functional via nested architecture	Can scale up to 5,000 via dozens of nested sub-circles[9].
Town/Watershed	15,000–50,000	Theoretical viability	The latency of passing information up and down 4-5 layers introduces lag.
Region/Bioregion	0.5M–5M	Untested	Latency across 7+ layers of double-linking would likely cripple rapid crisis response.

Nation/Continent	50M–500M	Untested	Bureaucratic fragility at extreme scale.
Planet	8 Billion	Untested	Impossible to coordinate via direct double-linking.

Holacracy: The Algorithmic Hierarchy

Created by software entrepreneur Brian Robertson in 2007, Holacracy is a highly rigid, rule-bound system of self-management encoded in a formal, proprietary Constitution. Practitioners claim it entirely replaces traditional management with a distributed authority system of nested circles, "lead links," and "rep links," strictly dividing meetings into tactical (operational) and governance (structural) variants[16]. The empirical record is dominated by its implementation at Zappos in 2015 by CEO Tony Hsieh. Hsieh forced adoption via a 4,700-word ultimatum, offering generous severance to non-believers. Ultimately, 18% accepted the severance, and total turnover reached 29% for the year, compared to a baseline of 20%[17]. The system proved so logistically burdensome that prominent early adopters, such as the publishing platform Medium, publicly abandoned it in 2016, citing the massive coordination tax. Modern scholarship, notably the 2016 *Harvard Business Review* analysis by Ethan Bernstein et al., infers that while Holacracy successfully clarifies roles, the organizational overhead is devastating[20]. Empirical surveys of transitioning companies noted severe fragmentation; in one case, the average employee held 5.4 roles and 11.4 distinct accountabilities, leading to chronic cognitive overload, disempowerment, and decision fatigue[10].

Capture Test Holacracy is uniquely susceptible to psychopathic capture through legalistic "rules lawyering." The Constitution is notoriously arcane, allowing those who master its procedural nuances to dominate governance meetings and invalidate the tensions of less legally-minded participants. Furthermore, the "Lead Link"—tasked with assigning individuals to roles—frequently devolves into a covert managerial dictator. Tony Hsieh's rollout at Zappos represents the ultimate top-down dictatorial capture: a supposedly horizontal system was unilaterally forced upon a population of 1,500 by a CEO who held ultimate financial leverage[18].

Strongest Case Against Management theorists Gary Hamel and Ethan Bernstein deliver the definitive critique, arguing that Holacracy misdiagnoses the utility of hierarchy. By obsessing over algorithmic structural roles, it generates a "naive social experiment" that drastically inflates administrative overhead while callously ignoring human psychological needs for stable mentorship and clear career progression[22].

Scale Rung	Population	Viability and Historical Efficacy	Failure Modes and Limiting Factors

Household	4–10	Failure	The constitutional overhead suffocates basic daily action.
Hamlet/Band	30–50	Functional but taxing	Requires intense training and continuous constitutional reference.
Village	150–500	Operational	Medium abandoned it at this scale due to the high coordination tax.
Parish/District	1,500–5,000	Severely strained	Zappos (1,500) required massive logistical resources to track hundreds of circles, modifying it after 2020[23].
Town/Watershed	15,000–50,000	Untested	Bureaucratic friction would trigger total operational gridlock.
Region/Bioregion	0.5M–5M	Untested	Structurally unviable.
Nation/Continent	50M–500M	Untested	Structurally unviable.
Planet	8 Billion	Untested	Structurally unviable.

Robert's Rules of Order and Majority Procedure

Published in 1876 by US Army engineer Henry Martyn Robert, this parliamentary manual formalized majority rule with strict protocols for debate, amendments, and point-of-order interjections[26].

Practitioners claim the system ensures absolute fairness, protects the minority's right to debate, and guarantees the majority's right to decide efficiently. The empirical record confirms it is the most ubiquitous governance protocol in modern Western history, utilized by millions of municipal bodies, corporate boards, and nonprofits. Modern scholarship, however, recognizes that its procedural density naturally centralizes power among a specialized parliamentary elite, often transforming democratic deliberation into a procedural battlefield.

Capture Test Robert's Rules are famously susceptible to Machiavellian capture. A skilled parliamentarian can silence opponents by layering obscure procedural motions (e.g., moving to table, calling the previous question, appealing the chair) that confuse the assembly[26]. Once the rank-and-file are sufficiently bewildered or fatigued, a dark-triad faction can ram through its agenda. The system's only defense is the presence of an independent, strict, and impartial parliamentarian, which merely shifts the point of capture to a single expert vulnerability.

Strongest Case Against Alice Sturgis, author of the *Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure* (1950), argued that Robert's Rules are antiquated, unnecessarily adversarial, and overly complex, serving to enable obstructionism rather than facilitate clear democratic action[27].

Scale Rung	Population	Viability and Historical Efficacy	Failure Modes and Limiting Factors
Household	4–10	Failure	Absurdly formal and relationally destructive at intimate scales.
Hamlet/Band	30–50	Functional	Often used in small corporate boards or HOAs, but can feel overly rigid.
Village	150–500	Highly functional	Standard protocol for municipal town halls and union locals.
Parish/District	1,500–5,000	Highly functional	Effectively manages large representative

			conventions.
Town/Watershed	15,000–50,000	Functional via representation	Requires elected delegates; general assemblies at this scale fail.
Region/Bioregion	0.5M–5M	Functional via representation	Standard parliamentary procedure for regional legislatures.
Nation/Continent	50M–500M	Functional via representation	Ubiquitous in national congresses and parliaments.
Planet	8 Billion	Functional via representation	Operates in the UN General Assembly.

The Occupy General Assembly: Modified Consensus

Emerging globally in 2011 during the Occupy Wall Street protests, the General Assembly (GA) utilized a "modified consensus" model[29].

Practitioners, heavily influenced by anarchist anthropologists like David Graeber, claimed the GA was a leaderless, perfectly egalitarian space. It deployed the "progressive stack" to privilege marginalized voices and required a 90% voting threshold to override a structural block[29]. The empirical record shows that while GAs successfully facilitated early collective effervescence and tactical alignment, they quickly degenerated into paralyzing dysfunction. Modern scholarship infers that the GA's militant rejection of formal delegation rendered it incapable of strategic longevity or complex resource management.

Capture Test The GA was easily captured by covert, charismatic narcissists. Because there were no formal leadership structures, informal leaders instantly emerged—usually those with the loudest voices, the most free time, and the lowest aversion to public conflict[29]. Furthermore, the 90% modified consensus threshold allowed a tiny, dedicated faction of obstructionists (or agent provocateurs) to effectively veto the will of thousands, exerting a tyrannical minority control over the encampments.

Strongest Case Against Sociologists, building on Jo Freeman's classic "The Tyranny of Structurelessness," and contemporary scholars like Francesca Polletta, argue that the fetishization of structurelessness inevitably creates a shadow hierarchy. Without formal

mechanisms for accountability, the most aggressive individuals dominate the space, while the working-class and marginalized are driven away by the sheer temporal cost of enduring marathon, unfocused meetings.

Scale Rung	Population	Viability and Historical Efficacy	Failure Modes and Limiting Factors
Household	4–10	Functional	Similar to casual family consensus.
Hamlet/Band	30–50	Functional	Capable of organizing short-term direct action.
Village	150–500	Temporarily functional	Begins to experience severe meeting fatigue and ideological fracturing.
Parish/District	1,500–5,000	Total failure	At Occupy Oakland/Wall Street, assemblies of this size required agonizing hours to pass trivial resolutions[29].
Town/Watershed	15,000–50,000	Structurally impossible	Acoustic and temporal limits prevent mass open consensus.
Region/Bioregion	0.5M–5M	Untested	Impossible.
Nation/Continent	50M–500M	Untested	Impossible.
Planet	8 Billion	Untested	Impossible.

Zapatista Assemblies: Juntas de Buen Gobierno

Following the 1994 armed uprising in Chiapas, Mexico, the Zapatista Army of National Liberation (EZLN) established autonomous, stateless municipalities. In 2003, they formalized the *Juntas de Buen Gobierno* (Councils of Good Government) to coordinate across regions[30]. Practitioners claim this is a radical realization of *mandar obedeciendo* (leading by obeying), wherein rotating delegates from local assemblies execute the will of the grassroots without accumulating executive power or salaries. The historical record demonstrates a stunning longevity, sustaining an autonomous infrastructure—including schools, clinics, and justice systems—for over 300,000 people across three decades[32]. Modern scholars, such as David Harvey and John Holloway, celebrate this architecture as a functional, anti-capitalist "crack" in neoliberal globalization[33]. However, deep ethnographies reveal a persistent dual-power reality beneath the civilian aesthetic.

Capture Test The structural vulnerability of the Zapatista model is intrinsically tied to its origins as an armed insurgency. While civilian assemblies effectively handle administrative duties, land disputes, and municipal services, ultimate strategic, military, and diplomatic power remains heavily centralized within the Clandestine Revolutionary Indigenous Committee (CCRI) and formerly with charismatic mestizo figures like Subcomandante Marcos[35]. A dark-triad actor within the military high command can effectively override the civilian *Juntas* at any time under the guise of "military necessity," counter-insurgency, or state security threats.

Strongest Case Against Critics argue that the Zapatista civilian democracy is a carefully curated performance that masks the immutable authority of the EZLN military high command. This renders the *Juntas* an administrative buffer and logistical support apparatus for the army, rather than a truly sovereign, supreme legislative body[37].

Scale Rung	Population	Viability and Historical Efficacy	Failure Modes and Limiting Factors
Household	4–10	Highly functional	Based on indigenous communal traditions.
Hamlet/Band	30–50	Highly functional	Manages daily agricultural and judicial matters locally.
Village	150–500	Highly functional	Forms the bedrock of the autonomous municipalities.

Parish/District	1,500–5,000	Functional via delegation	Delegates interface at the Caracol level.
Town/Watershed	15,000–50,000	Functional via the Juntas	Rotating representatives integrate governance for ~300,000 people[32].
Region/Bioregion	0.5M–5M	Untested	Relies heavily on specific indigenous cosmologies and wartime solidarity.
Nation/Continent	50M–500M	Untested	Unlikely to scale without a state apparatus.
Planet	8 Billion	Untested	Impossible.

Rojava: Democratic Confederalism

In the power vacuum created by the Syrian Civil War in 2012, the Kurdish Democratic Union Party (PYD) implemented "Democratic Confederalism," an ideology theorized by imprisoned PKK leader Abdullah Öcalan, heavily synthesizing the social ecology of American anarchist Murray Bookchin[40].

Practitioners claim it is a stateless, anti-capitalist, feminist, and ecological democracy built fundamentally on nested neighborhood communes[42]. The empirical record confirms the establishment of a poly-ethnic federation managing millions of people, pioneering strict gender quotas (mandating male and female co-chairs for all bodies), and successfully repelling the existential threat of ISIS[42]. Modern scholarship, however, offers a much harsher inference of the political reality on the ground.

Capture Test The Rojava model serves as an ongoing historical case study in ideological capture by a vanguard party. Under the perpetual threat of existential war, the PYD and its military wing (YPG/YPJ) stepped into the governance void left by the Assad regime[40]. Despite the utopian rhetoric of bottom-up communes driving policy, real power—including military strategy, internal security (Asayish), and macroeconomic policy—is fiercely monopolized by senior PYD cadres[40]. Communes are frequently relegated to municipal service delivery (e.g., distributing bread and fuel) rather than exercising legislative supremacy[40]. Machiavellian capture here takes the form of the "military leviathan": leadership invokes endless security crises to justify top-down dictatorial control while maintaining the aesthetic of Bookchin's

radical municipalism[45].

Strongest Case Against Michiel Leezenberg (2016) and reports from the International Crisis Group argue that Rojava operates practically as a "Leninist one-party statelet." The PYD routinely harasses, arrests, or exiles political opposition, demonstrating a profound, perhaps unbridgeable gap between the libertarian municipalist theory and the authoritarian reality of wartime Kurdish governance[41].

Scale Rung	Population	Viability and Historical Efficacy	Failure Modes and Limiting Factors
Household	4–10	Functional	Base communal unit.
Hamlet/Band	30–50	Functional	Neighborhood communes handle basic dispute resolution.
Village	150–500	Functional	District councils coordinate local resources.
Parish/District	1,500–5,000	Functional	City and regional councils.
Town/Watershed	15,000–50,000	Functional	Poly-ethnic administrative boards.
Region/Bioregion	0.5M–5M	Functionally managed	Governs millions, but heavily reliant on the PYD vanguard and wartime mobilization[44].
Nation/Continent	50M–500M	Untested	Unlikely to hold together without the unifying threat of external invasion.

Planet	8 Billion	Untested	Impossible.

The Landsgemeinde: Open-Air Assembly Democracy

The Landsgemeinde is an annual, open-air citizen assembly practiced in Swiss cantons, most notably surviving in Appenzell Inner-Rhodes and Glarus[47].

Practitioners view it as the purest surviving form of direct democracy, where citizens physically gather in a town square to debate and vote on cantonal laws and budgets by a show of hands. The historical record shows centuries of continuous, uninterrupted operation, projecting an aura of deep civic stability. Modern scholarship, however, meticulously dismantles the romanticization of the open assembly.

Capture Test The Landsgemeinde is dangerously vulnerable to capture through systemic social coercion. Because voting is conducted publicly by raising hands (meaning there is no secret ballot), local economic elites, powerful employers, and charismatic landlords can easily intimidate the working class into conformity. A Machiavellian faction merely has to position its enforcers visibly in the crowd to suppress dissenting votes.

Strongest Case Against Political scientists Schaub and Rochat (2025) provide devastating empirical evidence against the Landsgemeinde. Their quantitative analysis reveals that participation rates in these assemblies are consistently and significantly lower (~20%) than in cantons utilizing secret ballot votes[47]. Furthermore, there is massive, documented social selectivity: citizens with tertiary education and high socioeconomic status are significantly overrepresented[47]. The physical and temporal costs of attending a day-long assembly systematically disenfranchise the marginalized, who cannot afford the time away from work or the social risk of public dissent[47].

Scale Rung	Population	Viability and Historical Efficacy	Failure Modes and Limiting Factors
Household	4–10	N/A	Not applicable to this structure.
Hamlet/Band	30–50	N/A	Not applicable to this structure.
Village	150–500	Functional	Similar to historical town halls.
Parish/District	1,500–5,000	Functional	Standard municipal assembly size.

Town/Watershed	15,000–50,000	Functional limit	Glarus and Appenzell operate near this scale as an annual legislative rubber-stamp[48].
Region/Bioregion	0.5M–5M	Total failure	Impossible to physically co-locate millions in a single square; acoustic limits exceeded.
Nation/Continent	50M–500M	Untested	Physically impossible.
Planet	8 Billion	Untested	Physically impossible.

Comparison Table of Decision Methods

Governance Model	Optimal Scale	Decision Speed	Inclusion / Selectivity	Documented Capture / Vulnerability	Empirical Base (Grade)
Quaker Business Method	Village to Parish	Very Slow	Low inclusion (demands theological/cultural conformity to function)	The "Clerk" dictating unity (1827 Schism)[5]	B (Rigorous Historical/Ethnographic)
Sociocracy (Endenburg)	Village to Parish	Moderate	High (structured rounds mandate that every voice is	Veto-tyranny via "paramount objections" by articulate	B (Empirical Case Studies / Romme)

			heard)	elites[11]	
Holacracy	Village to Parish	Fast (Ops) / Slow (Gov)	Low (massive role fragmentation & cognitive load exclude many)	Rules-lawyering; Dictatorial CEO mandate (Zappos 2015)[17]	A (HBR, Quant surveys, Sample N=268)[20]
Robert's Rules	Village to Nation	Fast	Moderate (highly exclusionary to those without procedural literacy)	Parliamentary maneuvering to silence minorities[27]	A (Widespread historical application)
Occupy GA	Hamlet to Village	Glacial	High in theory, extremely low in practice (fatigue drives attrition)	Shadow hierarchies; loud charismatic dominance[29]	B (Sociological analysis / Polletta)
Zapatista Assemblies	Parish to Region	Slow	High (grassroots indigenous representation across 5,000 delegates)	Covert military veto by CCRI high command[36]	B (Longitudinal ethnography)
Rojava (Dem. Confed.)	Parish to Region	Fast (by decree)	High locally, low strategically (PYD	Leninist vanguard party monopoliza	B (Political science field

			monopoly over defense/economy)	tion[41]	reports)
Landsgemeinde	Parish to Town	Fast	Very Low (~20% turnout, heavy tertiary education elite bias)[47]	Social coercion; lack of secret ballot suppresses dissent[47]	A (Statistical/ Survey data)

Evidence Grades: A = Large-N studies/widespread quantitative data; B = Rigorous historical/ethnographic case studies; C = Practitioner anecdotes.

Summary of Robust Findings

Structurelessness invariably breeds shadow hierarchies dominated by the most aggressive, charismatic, or privileged individuals. Consensus (100% agreement) scales inversely with population diversity and size, routinely collapsing past 150 people without intense cultural homogeny. Consent (lack of paramount objection) scales better than consensus but remains vulnerable to capture by highly articulate obstructionists. Direct open-air assemblies (Landsgemeinde) suppress participation to roughly 20% and heavily favor educated elites compared to secret ballots. Double-linking (Sociocracy) is the most empirically robust mechanism for mitigating information silos between nested governance tiers. Over-formalization (Holacracy) generates severe cognitive overload, disempowering workers through extreme role fragmentation. Revolutionary grassroots assemblies (Zapatistas, Rojava) successfully manage municipal affairs but systematically surrender macroeconomic and military strategy to vanguard leaderships. Conflict aversion (Quakers) allows dark-triad actors to paralyze groups via the perpetual threat of disunity. Majority rule (Robert's Rules) is the fastest and most scalable method but requires independent moderation to prevent procedural weaponization. Secret ballots remain the only historically proven defense against local social coercion and intimidation in legislative voting.

Contested or Open Questions

- Can a sociocratic double-linked network scale to a region (5 million+ people) without succumbing to extreme information latency in a macroscopic crisis response?
- Is it possible to decouple Rojava's or the Zapatistas' localized assembly success from the unifying, coercive force of an existential external military threat?
- How can Sociocracy 3.0 integrate the speed of executive fiat during a time-sensitive, life-or-death crisis without permanently establishing an autocratic precedent?

Sources to Read in Full

1. Sheeran, M. J. (1983). *Beyond Majority Rule: Voteless Decisions in the Religious Society of*

Friends.
2. Bernstein, E., et al. (2016). *Beyond the Holacracy Hype*. Harvard Business Review.
3. Romme, A. G. L. (1999). *Domination, Self-Determination and Circular Organizing*.
4. Schaub, M. (2012). *Maximising Direct Democracy*.
5. Leezenberg, M. (2016). *The Ambiguities of Democratic Autonomy: The Kurdish Movement in Turkey and Rojava*.
6. Polletta, F. (2012). *Freedom Is an Endless Meeting*.
7. Buck, J., & Villines, S. (2007). *We the People: Consenting to a Deeper Democracy*.
8. Rau, T., & Koch-Gonzalez, J. (2018). *Many Voices One Song: Shared Power with Sociocracy*.
9. Sturgis, A. (1950). *Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure*.

Implementability after the Fall

The loss of the state, the electrical grid, and internet infrastructure fundamentally alters the viability of these models. To survive, governance must be stripped of digital bureaucratic overhead and ideological purity. The minimum viable model for post-collapse survival merges the speed of majority rule with the feedback loops of sociocracy.

- **The Household (4 to 10 people):**
  - *Minimum Viable Version:* Informal consent based on Sociocracy 3.0 patterns.
  - *What it needs to start:* A shared calendar and a physical ledger for duty rosters to ensure caloric and labor equity.
  - *First Failure to Expect:* A charismatic or aggressive patriarch/matriarch will use the excuse of "survival efficiency" to bypass the consent process, reverting the household to standard autocracy.
- **The Village (300 people):**
  - *Minimum Viable Version:* Classical Sociocracy. The village is divided into domain-specific circles (e.g., water management, perimeter security, agriculture).
  - *What it needs to start:* High literacy rates, physical logbooks (for recording meeting minutes and tracking policy), a central physical meeting place protected from the elements, and a trained, neutral facilitator.
  - *First Failure to Expect:* The "paramount objection" will be weaponized by an aggrieved family lineage to halt a necessary but painful resource allocation—such as severe water rationing—paralyzing the village during a drought.
- **The District (3,000 people):**
  - *Minimum Viable Version:* A Representative Assembly utilizing a simplified Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure (Sturgis), fed by double-linked delegates ascending from the Village circles.
  - *What it needs to start:* A dedicated courier class for latency-free communication between villages, a heavily guarded central repository of records, and the mandatory reintroduction of the **secret ballot** for all contentious resource decisions to prevent interfamilial violence.
  - *First Failure to Expect:* The delegates sent to the District level will form an insular political class, ceasing to act as bidirectional conduits of information (double-linking) and

beginning to act as a centralized vanguard authority (the "CCRI/PYD" dual-power failure mode).

Principles

- The Law of Shadow Hierarchy: Any governance arrangement that claims to be entirely structureless will rapidly develop a shadow hierarchy dominated by the most aggressive, socially privileged, or charismatic actors.
- The Inverse Scale of Consensus: The viability of 100% consensus decision-making is inversely proportional to the size of the population and the diversity of their material interests.
- The Procedural Literacy Stratification: The more complex a set of rules, the faster power centralizes into the hands of a procedural elite who memorize and weaponize the rulebook.
- The Coercion of the Open Vote: Open-air, public voting mechanisms structurally disenfranchise the socioeconomically vulnerable through the implicit threat of social or economic retaliation.
- The Dual-Power Trap: Grassroots municipal assemblies born out of military conflict will inevitably be subordinated by the central military command the moment strategic or security imperatives arise.

Works cited

1. Developing appreciations for unknowing in reflexive practice, https://hull-repository.worktribe.com/index.php/OutputFile/443004
2. the case of Quaker decision-making - White Rose Research Online, https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/134188/1/R2%20JMSR%20Organizational%20Ethnography%20and%20Religious%20Organizations.pdf
3. Elias Hicks - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Elias_Hicks
4. An exploration of conflict handling among Quakers, https://eprints.hud.ac.uk/id/eprint/5945/1/417307.pdf
5. Archival Information, https://muse.jhu.edu/article/394670
6. Philadelphia Yearly Meeting - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philadelphia_Yearly_Meeting
7. Hicksite and Orthodox Reunite : r/Quakers - Reddit, https://www.reddit.com/r/Quakers/comments/1ji8xt1/hicksite_and_orthodox_reunite/
8. George W. Taylor, a Practical Antislavery Man - Quaker Studies, https://quakerstudies.openlibhums.org/article/id/29297/
9. Sociocracy 3.0: Guide to Consent-Based Governance - Peerdom, https://peerdom.com/blog/sociocracy-guide-principles-practices
10. The contrasting contributions of holacracy to deliberative democracy, https://shs.cairn.info/revue-rimhe-2019-2-page-3a?lang=en
11. Governing for the Common Good: The Possibilities of Sociocracy in, https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/voluntas/article/governing-for-the-common-good-the-possibilities-of-sociocracy-in-nonprofit-organizations/5ABEA698

5AD4D87B0AAC99CBA843E3A5
12. (PDF) The sociocratic model of organizing - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228053863_The_sociocratic_model_of_organizing
13. Metasynthesis and Research on Sociocracy (MARS), https://www.sociocracyforall.org/research-on-sociocracy/
14. Sociocracy: the 4 principles, the history, the limits - Rolebase, https://rolebase.io/en/blog/sociocracy-intro
15. PARTICIPATION IN SOCIOCRATIC ORGANIZATIONS, https://msed.vse.cz/msed_2023/article/722-Polderl-Claudia-paper.pdf
16. Holacracy: managerial revolution or organizational challenge?, https://wedo.com/blog/holacracy-managerial-revolution-or-organizational-challenge
17. Zappos' Holacracy: An OD Intervention Guide - Scribd, https://www.scribd.com/document/802388387/OD-Final-notes
18. (PDF) Zappos: An Experiment in Holacracy - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/330125812_Zappos_An_Experiment_in_Holacracy
19. The Zappos Exodus Wasn't About Holacracy, Says Tony Hsieh, https://www.fastcompany.com/3055657/the-zappos-exodus-wasnt-about-holacracy-says-tony-hsieh
20. Beyond the Holacracy Hype: The overwrought claims—and actual, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/305317303_Beyond_the_Holacracy_Hype_The_overwrought_claims-and_actual_promise-of_the_next_generation_of_self-managed_teams
21. Organizational Self-Management Practices and Employee, https://www.preprints.org/manuscript/202601.0766
22. When the hierarchy folds: how employees may react, https://www.emerald.com/jbs/article/45/2/98/1220581/When-the-hierarchy-folds-how-employees-may-react
23. Holacracy Case Studies: Lessons from Zappos, Buurtzorg & 45, https://www.si-labs.com/en/articles/holacracy-case-studies/
24. Management 14th Edition Textbook by Richard L. Daft - Studylib, https://studylib.net/doc/27827894/richard-l.-daft---management--mindtap-course-list--cengag...
25. Library and Information Center Management (Barbara B. Moran, https://www.scribd.com/document/727608398/Library-and-Information-Center-Management-Barbara-B-Moran-Claudia-J-Morner-Z-Library-2
26. Parliamentary Procedure Blog - Jim Slaughter Parliamentarian, https://www.jimslaughter.com/parliamentarian-blog-posts
27. Overview of the Standard Code of Procedure | PDF | Parliamentary, https://www.scribd.com/document/355883696/The-Standard-Code-of-Parliamentary-Procedure-docx
28. American Institute of Parliamentarians Standard Code ... - Apple Books, https://books.apple.com/us/book/american-institute-of-parliamentarians-standar

d-code/id6470701098
29. REAL DEMOCRACY IN THE OCCUPY MOVEMENT, https://mural.maynoothuniversity.ie/id/eprint/7761/1/Anna%20Szolucha%20PhD%20Thesis.pdf
30. Zapatistas: new environmental subjects? - WUR eDepot, https://edepot.wur.nl/629477
31. Conversations with Durito: Stories of the Zapatistas and Neoliberalism, https://schoolsforchiapas.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/cwdcomplete_0.pdf
32. Duke University Dissertation Template, https://dukespace.lib.duke.edu/server/api/core/bitstreams/03b4f403-3329-48b0-a07c-64dab6645bc5/content
33. Holloway - Crack Capitalism.pdf - Libcom.org, https://files.libcom.org/files/Holloway%20-%20Crack%20Capitalism.pdf
34. Politics by Other Means: Rhizomes of Power in Argentina's Social, https://scholarworks.umass.edu/bitstreams/1e5e99d7-6932-4f39-ade2-f9bb1857953d/download
35. To Lead by Obeying: The Political Lessons of Mexican Neo-Zapatismo, https://library.oapen.org/bitstream/20.500.12657/110042/1/9781433196737.pdf
36. Zapatistas: Rebellion from the Grassroots to the Global, https://dokumen.pub/zapatistas-rebellion-from-the-grassroots-to-the-global-9781350224186-9781848132085.html
37. Strategic Translations: The Zapatistas from Silence to Dignity, https://researchsystem.canberra.edu.au/ws/portalfiles/portal/33690751/file
38. Indigenous Rights and Internal Wars: The Chiapas Conflict at 15 Years, https://digitalcommons.kennesaw.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1684&context=facpubs
39. The Zapatista Rebellion in Chiapas, Mexico - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/248966641_Globalization_and_Social_Movement_Resistance_The_Zapatista_Rebellion_in_Chiapas_Mexico
40. Lessons From Rojava for the Paradigm of Social Ecology, https://www.repository.cam.ac.uk/bitstreams/de7ef7a3-e98c-4c9c-b831-728badb74cf2/download
41. Democratic Confederalism in Syria - The Nation-State, the Kurds, https://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/id/eprint/10250/1/Democratic%20Confederalism%20in%20Syria%20-%20The%20Nation-State%2C%20the%20Kurds%2C%20and%20International%20Law.pdf
42. A Comparative Case Study of Iraqi Kurdistan and Syria Rojava, https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=8436&context=etd
43. Kurdish Disillusionment With The European Union, https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/nationalities-papers/article/kurdish-disillusionment-with-the-european-union/43B4D399E25F8777640364A95D6E30CD
44. A Call from Raqqa in - Berghahn Journals, https://www.berghahnjournals.com/view/journals/conflict-and-society/9/1/arcs090107.xml
45. The Kurdish movement in Turkey and Rojava | UvA-DARE (Digital,

https://pure.uva.nl/ws/files/40264791/The_ambiguities_of_democratic_autonomy_the_Kurdish_movement_in_Turkey_and_Rojava.pdf
46. Lessons From Rojava for the Paradigm of Social Ecology - Frontiers, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/political-science/articles/10.3389/fpos.2021.815338/full
47. Assembly democracy between social selectivity and equality, https://s3.eu-central-1.amazonaws.com/ext-linst-c5-web-liechtenstein-institut.li-2019/9517/6355/1969/Schaub_Rochat_SPSR_2025_Assembly_democracy_between_social_selectivity_and_equality.pdf
48. Swiss Democracy - OAPEN Library, https://library.oapen.org/bitstream/id/92df684c-ce71-435a-87ac-5762545f760f/2021_Book_SwissDemocracy.pdf
49. Popular assembly - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Popular_assembly