MO-06 Cooperatives at scale: Mondragon and the degeneration thesis

1. The Degeneration Thesis and the Theoretical Dilemma of Scaled Cooperation

Worker and producer cooperatives occupy a contested terrain in institutional economics. Long celebrated as democratic bastions capable of eliminating surplus value extraction and worker alienation, they are equally suspected of containing structural flaws that doom them to commercial failure, oligarchic ossification, or capitalist degeneration.

The systematic articulation of this critique emerged with Beatrice and Sidney Webb in *Industrial Democracy* (1897) and *The Consumers' Co-operative Movement* (1921)[1]. The Webbs argued that worker-owned manufacturing enterprises—what they termed *associations of producers*—suffer from two structural defects:

1. **The shopfloor discipline dilemma**: Frontline laborers who elect their own supervisors cannot submit to the administrative discipline required for complex industrial coordination[1].
2. **The informational boundary**: Manual producers are structural amateurs regarding volatile macroeconomic trade cycles, capital allocations, and consumer demand curves[1].

The Webbs posited a deterministic life cycle of cooperative degeneration. Unsuccessful cooperatives collapse from indiscipline, under-capitalization, and technical stagnation[1]. Conversely, commercially thriving cooperatives degenerate into exclusive closed cartels: to protect high dividend yields and capital balances, founding members refuse to admit newer generations of workers as full voting peers, choosing instead to hire unfranchised wage laborers[1]. Through this dynamic, the successful cooperative transforms into a conventional capitalist firm owned by a shrinking cohort of rentier workers[2].

This thesis was reinforced across European sociology and political theory. Franz Oppenheimer, in *Die Siedlungsgenossenschaft* (1896), formulated his "Law of Transformation" (*Transformationsgesetz*), asserting that productive cooperatives invariably either fail economically or abandon their egalitarian baseline by closing membership and metamorphosing into joint-stock corporations[4]. Robert Michels, in *Zur Soziologie des Parteiwesens in der modernen Demokratie* (1911), formulated the "Iron Law of Oligarchy," showing that large, complex organizations inevitably centralize decision-making authority in a specialized, self-perpetuating executive cadre, reducing democratic general assemblies to passive bodies.

In twentieth-century neoclassical and institutional economics, this structural skepticism crystallized into formal microeconomic models:

Armen Alchian and Harold Demsetz (1972) modeled the firm as a specialized nexus of contracts to resolve shirking in joint team production. They concluded that without an outside residual claimant armed with unilateral authority to monitor work effort and retain net cash flows,

team-governed associations suffer from debilitating free-rider problems.

Michael Jensen and William Meckling (1979) identified the "horizon problem" and portfolio constraints inherent to labor-managed firms: because a worker-member's claim on firm net earnings is strictly contingent on active employment tenure, members prefer distributing operating surpluses as immediate wages rather than retaining earnings for long-term research, plant expansion, or capital goods whose returns accrue beyond their individual retirement horizons. This creates structural under-capitalization, heavy reliance on debt, and severe risk aversion, because a worker's human capital and financial savings are tied to a single enterprise[6].

Henry Hansmann, in *The Ownership of Enterprise* (1996), showed that the viability of producer, consumer, and worker ownership depends on the homogeneity of member interests. As an enterprise scales, diversifies product lines, adopts varied technologies, and develops distinct age cohorts, the transaction costs of collective democratic choice escalate, resulting in operational paralysis or factional predation.

Econometric Testing: Reevaluating the Degeneration Thesis

Modern empirical and econometric literature has subjected these classical deductions to rigorous longitudinal scrutiny, complicating the claim of inevitable decay.

Empirical Metric	Classical Prediction (Webb / Jensen / Alchian)	Econometric Finding	Key Literature Citations
Enterprise Survival Rates	Systematic premature failure; higher hazard rates than capitalist peers[1].	Survival rates equal or superior to conventional firms; 20% to 29% lower hazard rates in panel data[7].	Gabriel Burdín (2014); Virginie Pérotin (2006, 2016); Ben Craig & John Pencavel (1992, 1995)[7].
Employment vs. Wage Elasticity	Standard downward-sloping labor demand; employment volatile across trade shocks[11].	Cooperatives stabilize headcounts and hours, absorbing shocks through democratic pay adjustments[2].	Ben Craig & John Pencavel (1992, 1994); Gabriel Burdín & Andrés Dean (2009)[3].
Capital Accumulation	Chronic under-capitalizatio n via the horizon problem;	Mandatory indivisible reserves secure capital parity; high retained	Virginie Pérotin (2010, 2016); Gabriel Burdín (2014); George et

	short-term dividend stripping.	earnings over long durations[7].	al. (2020)[7].
Shopfloor Productivity & Monitoring	Free-riding and shirking dominate; high monitoring costs in the absence of an owner-boss.	Horizontal peer monitoring lowers managerial overhead; total factor productivity matches or exceeds peers[6].	Ben Craig & John Pencavel (1995); Virginie Pérotin (2016); Fakhfakh, Pérotin & Gago (2012)[6].

Analyzing longitudinal data from the worker-owned plywood cooperatives of the Pacific Northwest (a sample of 300 to 400 mills in Oregon and Washington observed between 1968 and 1986), John Pencavel and Ben Craig demonstrated that worker-managed firms display behavioral mechanics fundamentally distinct from conventional capitalist sawmills[6]. When timber markets collapsed, conventional mills protected profit margins by laying off workers, generating high employment volatility[6]. Plywood cooperatives preserved stable employment and aggregate plant hours, absorbing market contractions by democratically voting to reduce member hourly wages and defer share distributions[2]. Furthermore, Craig and Pencavel found that the plywood cooperatives operated with substantially fewer managerial supervisors per line worker, relied on peer enforcement to maintain speed, and produced total factor productivity 6% to 14% higher than conventional union and non-union mills[6].

The eventual decline of the Pacific Northwest mills did not stem from shopfloor indiscipline. Instead, it occurred via a variant of the property-rights transfer problem: as mills prospered, member equity shares appreciated to between $80,000 and $100,000, creating an insurmountable capital barrier for incoming younger operators[6]. Retiring worker-owners, facing the liquidation of their life savings, voted to dissolve the cooperative form and sell their mills to conventional multinational timber conglomerates[6].

Gabriel Burdín and Andrés Dean (2009, 2012), utilizing Uruguayan social security panels tracking thousands of firms and employees across two decades, corroborated these dynamics[2]. Uruguayan worker-managed firms showed lower employment adjustment elasticities than capitalist firms, absorbing macroeconomic shocks through wage flexibility[12]. Investigating firm lifespans, Burdín (2014) showed that worker-managed firms exhibited an annual hazard rate of closure 20% to 29% *lower* than conventional firms in identical sectors after controlling for firm scale, capital-labor ratios, and workforce age[7]. Crucially, Burdín found no systemic evidence that successful Uruguayan cooperatives degenerated by substituting hired wage hands for departed worker-members in core production roles[2]. Hired non-member labor remained concentrated in seasonal, non-core peripheral tasks[2].

Virginie Pérotin (2006, 2010, 2016), evaluating registry populations in France (*Sociétés Coopératives et Participatives*, SCOPs), the United Kingdom, and Italy, demonstrated that worker cooperatives are neither smaller nor less capital-intensive than conventional firms in

equivalent industries[7]. French SCOPs survived market downturns at statistically higher rates, maintained higher capital reinvestment rates via statutory indivisible reserves, and matched conventional enterprises in productive efficiency[7].

The empirical record indicates that the Webbs' assertion of inherent productive incompetence is incorrect[1]. However, the institutional mechanisms that allow cooperatives to succeed at small to medium scales—intense horizontal peer surveillance, common culture, and wage flexibility—encounter severe limits when enterprises scale into multi-thousand-worker federations operating across disconnected geographic boundaries.

2. Mondragon: The Apex of Scaled Industrial Cooperativism

Historical Genesis and Institutional Architecture

The Mondragon Corporation (*Mondragón Corporación Cooperativa*, MCC), centered in the Alto Deba valley of Gipuzkoa in the Spanish Basque Country, is the world's most complex federation of industrial worker cooperatives[15]. The initiative was catalyzed by Father José María Arizmendiarrieta, a Catholic curate and Basque nationalist sympathizer who arrived in the industrial town of Mondragón in 1941[16]. Arizmendiarrieta synthesized Catholic social teaching (*Rerum Novarum*, *Quadragesimo Anno*), personalist philosophy, and Basque communal traditions—most notably *auzolana*, an ancient custom of reciprocal, village-wide communal labor—to combat regional poverty and youth unemployment under Francoist autarky[16].

In 1943, Arizmendiarrieta mobilized local donations to create a polytechnic school (*Escuela Profesional*)[16]. In 1956, five graduates—Jesús Larrañaga, Alfonso Gorroñogoitia, José María Ormaetxea, Luis Usatorre, and Javier Ortubay—purchased a bankrupt workshop in Vitoria, relocated operations to Mondragón, and established ULGOR (an acronym of their surnames), fabricating paraffin cookers and heaters[16]. Recognizing that traditional commercial banks would withhold credit from worker-managed entities, Arizmendiarrieta led the establishment of the Caja Laboral Popular (People's Labor Bank) in 1959[18]. The bank acted as a savings institution, strategic incubator, and auditing body, mobilizing local deposits to capitalize new worker cooperatives without reliance on external speculative equity[18].

The governance architecture developed across the Mondragon network balances representative democracy, executive technocracy, and shopfloor advocacy through distinct institutional organs:

- **The General Assembly (*Asamblea General*)**: The sovereign legislative body within each cooperative, composed of all worker-members and operating on the constitutional mandate of *one member, one vote*, irrespective of internal capital account balances or seniority[13]. The General Assembly meets annually to approve financial statements, determine the distribution of net operating surpluses, establish operational guidelines, and elect the Governing Council[19].
- **The Governing Council (*Consejo Rector*)**: The representative executive board, typically consisting of 8 to 12 worker-members elected by the General Assembly for staggered four-year terms[19]. It oversees firm management, safeguards cooperative principles, and

holds the sole power to appoint, monitor, and dismiss the Chief Executive Officer or General Manager (*Gerente*)[17].

- **The Social Council (*Consejo Social*)**: A shopfloor consultative assembly directly elected by operational work units (averaging one representative per 15 to 20 workers)[21]. Because Mondragon cooperatives rejected conventional adversarial trade unionism—operating on the premise that worker-owners cannot strike against their own property—the Social Council was designed to represent members *as workers* rather than *as owners*[18]. It oversees workplace health, industrial safety, ergonomic standards, job classification, and social welfare policies[18].
- **The Management Council (*Consejo de Dirección*)**: The executive body headed by the *Gerente*, responsible for day-to-day operations, supply-chain logistics, and commercial strategy[18].

At the confederation tier, Mondragon operates a federal architecture: primary cooperatives belong to Divisional Councils (Industrial, Retail, Financial, Knowledge), which elect representatives to the **Mondragon Cooperative Congress**[18]. The Congress convenes 650 delegates who establish confederation policies, coordinate cross-subsidy funds, and elect the Standing Committee (*Comisión Permanente*) and General Council (*Consejo General*)[18].

Remuneration Solidarity and Capital Structure

Mondragon rejected both total wage egalitarianism and unconstrained market executive compensation. It instituted internal wage compression ratios, originally fixed at 1:3 between the lowest-paid manual worker and the highest-earning general manager. As industrial engineering expanded and multinational competition mounted, this ratio was adjusted by democratic assembly votes to 1:6 in most primary cooperatives, with exceptional confederation allowances reaching 1:9 for specialized executives managing complex global groups[13]. The lowest base wage (*anticipos de consumo*) is pegged roughly 13% above prevailing regional manufacturing collective-bargaining agreements, while top managerial compensation sits at 30% to 50% below public-company benchmarks[13].

The financial model relies on two mechanisms designed to neutralize the Jensen-Meckling horizon problem:

1. **Individual Capital Accounts (*Cuentas de Capital*)**: Upon joining, every candidate pays an entry fee (historically equivalent to roughly one year of entry-level wages, approximately €15,000 to €18,000, typically financed via payroll deductions across three to four years)[13]. These funds are credited to the worker's individual capital account. Each fiscal year, up to 70% of net operating surpluses are allocated directly into these accounts rather than paid as liquid cash dividends[20]. The accounts earn interest (capped by statute) and remain locked within the firm as working equity until the member formally retires or resigns, at which point the capital is reimbursed over a multi-year amortization schedule[13].
2. **Indivisible Reserve Funds**: Spanish and Basque cooperative statutes mandate that a minimum of 20% of net operating surpluses be transferred to an indivisible reserve fund (*Fondo de Reserva Obligatorio*), and an additional 10% be directed to a community

education and promotion fund (*Fondo de Educación y Promoción*)[20]. These indivisible reserves belong permanently to the cooperative entity. They can never be liquidated or distributed to individual members, even upon enterprise dissolution, eliminating the incentive to asset-strip or liquidate successful cooperatives for windfall payouts.

Structural Faultlines: The 2013 Fagor Bankruptcy and the Decoupling of 2022

The resilience of Mondragon's governance architecture was tested by two structural crises in the early twenty-first century:

Crisis Event	Primary Structural Cause	Institutional Outcome	Key References
2013 Fagor Electrodomésticos Bankruptcy	Debt-financed foreign acquisitions (Brandt); collapse of Spanish construction sector; global competition from low-cost manufacturers[24].	Mondragon Congress halted bailouts; 1,895 Basque worker-owners relocated or retired via LagunAro; €1.1B liabilities liquidated; 3,500 foreign subsidiary workers laid off[24].	Basterretxea et al. (2013); Errasti et al. (2017)[13].
Decoupling of ULMA & Orona (Dec 16, 2022)	Conflict over centralized cooperative surplus pooling and corporate overhead; high-performing industrial units demanded operational and capital autonomy[20].	ULMA (2,800 members) and Orona (1,700 members) voted by 80.5% and 70% majorities to exit Mondragon; stripped MCC of ~15% of consolidated industrial revenue[15].	Rodgers (2022); Hadfield (2023)[27].
International Multi-Location Expansion	Need to defend market share abroad; inability to legally or culturally export Basque	Over 100 foreign subsidiaries operating on capitalist wage labor; non-member	Huet (2000); Errasti (2013); Flecha & Santa Cruz (2011)[15].

	cooperative rules to foreign jurisdictions (Poland, Mexico, China)[24].	workforce peaked near 50% of the group's total global personnel[18].	

The collapse of **Fagor Electrodomésticos** on October 16, 2013, represents the largest commercial failure in cooperative history[15]. Fagor, the original flagship cooperative founded in 1956, grew into a white-goods conglomerate with over 5,600 employees worldwide[16]. Facing fierce price competition from Turkish (Beko) and Chinese white-goods manufacturers, Fagor attempted to achieve economies of scale through debt-leveraged acquisitions, purchasing the French appliance manufacturer Brandt for €162 million in 2005.

When the 2008 financial crisis collapsed Spanish residential construction, domestic appliance sales dropped over 50%[24]. Between 2008 and 2012, Mondragon's central inter-cooperative solidarity funds channeled approximately €300 million in emergency loans and capital grants to keep Fagor operational[24]. Fagor's worker-members repeatedly voted to slash their own wages by up to 20% to reduce operating costs[24].

By late 2013, Fagor carried liabilities exceeding €1.1 billion and formally requested an additional €170 million cash injection from the Mondragon Cooperative Congress[24]. In an unprecedented democratic vote on October 28, 2013, the Standing Committee and General Council refused further funding, concluding that pouring additional solidarity capital into an unviable business model threatened the solvency of the entire federation and its financial anchor, Caja Laboral[25]. Fagor formally filed for bankruptcy protection[15].

The solidarity response that followed illustrated both the capacity and the structural boundaries of the cooperative system:

- Mondragon's proprietary social security institution, **LagunAro EPSV** (an autonomous welfare provider founded because Spanish law originally classified cooperative members as self-employed, excluding them from state unemployment compensation), immediately deployed safety nets[15]. LagunAro paid up to 80% of baseline wages in unemployment assistance to thousands of displaced worker-owners and processed hundreds of early retirements[26].
- Over the subsequent 24 months, Mondragon's central employment relocation office successfully reassigned 1,895 displaced Basque worker-owners into vacant positions across other surviving cooperatives within the federation (such as Fagor Ederlan, ULMA, Orona, Orkli, and Eroski)[18].
- Crucially, this solidarity net did not extend to workers in Fagor's non-cooperative international manufacturing subsidiaries: 3,500 wage laborers in France, Poland, and Morocco were laid off through standard corporate liquidation, starkly illustrating the bounded geographic perimeter of cooperative solidarity[24].

The second institutional fracture occurred on **December 16, 2022**, when the worker-owners of two of Mondragon's most profitable industrial engines—**ULMA Group** (scaffolding and building systems; ~2,800 members) and **Orona** (elevators and vertical transport; ~1,700 members)—voted decisively in special general assemblies to terminate their membership in the

Mondragon Corporation[15]. The secession was approved by 80.5% of ULMA's voting members and 70% of Orona's[23].

The rupture was driven by institutional friction: the leadership and rank-and-file of both industrial groups argued that Mondragon's centralized corporate bureaucracy was increasingly behaving like an extractive central state. ULMA and Orona complained that their high net surpluses were being disproportionately taxed to subsidize underperforming federated divisions, while MCC corporate leadership denied them the strategic autonomy to form their own capital alliances and joint ventures. The exit of ULMA and Orona stripped the Mondragon federation of roughly 15% of its consolidated industrial turnover, confirming that even when cooperatives resist external financial capture, they face centrifugal fragmentation when high-performing subunits perceive central solidarity levies as an uncompensated drag on their autonomy[15].

Scale Ledger: Mondragon Corporation

Governance Rung (Scale)	Status	Operational Reality & Historical Failure Threshold
Household (4–10)	Operates	Operates through domestic capital pooling and shared household budgets.
Hamlet / Band (30–50)	Operates	Direct personal contact; initial 1956 ULGOR plant (24 workers) maintained total trust.
Village (150–500)	Works	Optimal scale for single-plant General Assembly; direct peer monitoring, low alienation.
Parish / District (1,500–5,000)	Works	Scale of single large co-ops (Orona, ULMA); requires elected Governing & Social Councils.
Town / Watershed (15,000–50,000)	Works	Alto Deba regional federation; coordinated through Caja Laboral and regional schooling.

Region / Bioregion (0.5M–5M)	Strained	Basque autonomous community footprint (~80,000 workers); fragile balance between central solidarity levies and enterprise autonomy (triggered ULMA/Orona exit in 2022).
Nation / Continent (50M–500M)	Fails	Never democratically scaled; non-Basque Spanish units (e.g. Eroski supermarkets) showed sharply lower member conversion rates and high worker cynicism.
Planet (8 Billion)	Degenerates	International operations degenerated into standard multinational capitalism: foreign subsidiaries operate via conventional wage labor with zero voting equity.

Capture Test: Mondragon Corporation

1. Vulnerability to Dark-Triad Exploitation

- **Narcissism**: Narcissistic personalities emerge via corporate technocracy by leveraging Mondragon's prestige to construct high-visibility, aggressive international expansion programs (e.g., Fagor's global acquisitions) that satisfy executive grandiosity under the guise of "defending Basque industrial relevance."
- **Machiavellianism**: Machiavellian actors exploit the institutional fissure between the *Governing Council* and the *Social Council*. Because the Social Council lacks legal power to fire management, a manipulative manager can isolate it, dismiss its shopfloor grievances as "unproductive parochialism," and present curated financial data to the Governing Council to force consent.
- **Psychopathy**: Callous decision-makers exploit the legal firewall separating Basque parent cooperatives from foreign subsidiaries. They offshore dirty, dangerous, or uncompetitive manufacturing segments to non-cooperative wage-labor plants in developing economies without extending membership or profit sharing, externalizing market volatility onto unprotected workforces.

2. Historical Manifestation

During the rapid internationalization drive of 1995–2008, top management circles pushed through aggressive foreign mergers (e.g., Fagor's purchase of Brandt; Eroski's debt-heavy acquisition of Caprabo supermarkets in 2007 for €1.3 billion). Management utilized technical information asymmetry: rank-and-file members in General Assemblies, lacking expertise in international corporate finance, routinely approved massive commercial debt exposures on the recommendation of charismatic managerial executives who promised perpetual job security.

3. Counter-Features and Resistance Mechanisms

- **Right of Termination**: The ultimate check remains the Governing Council's statutory power to immediately dismiss the General Manager without shareholder protection.
- **Assembly Sovereign Veto**: Rank-and-file workers can vote down management proposals, as demonstrated when the General Council terminated capital flows to Fagor in 2013[25], and when members resisted corporate restructuring, culminating in the democratic exit votes of ULMA and Orona in 2022[23].
- **Wage Compression Cap**: The 1:6 internal compensation ceiling prevents corporate leaders from using compensation committees to engineer self-enriching equity packages, blunting financial extraction incentives for sociopathic managers[13].

3. Comparative Scaled Models

The Emilia-Romagna Cooperative Ecosystem (Italy)

The northern Italian region of Emilia-Romagna sustains one of the densest and most economically successful cooperative networks in the world[32]. Cooperatives account for over 30% of the regional GDP and produce substantial outputs across agro-industry (Granarolo, Parmigiano Reggiano consortia), manufacturing, logistics, retail (Coop Italia), and construction[32]. The ecosystem is organized under three central apex federations: **Legacoop** (historically aligned with the Italian Communist and Socialist parties), **Confcooperative** (aligned with the Catholic social tradition), and **AGCI** (republican and social-democratic)[32].

The Italian cooperative architecture is anchored in specific constitutional and legal protections:

- **Article 45 of the 1947 Italian Constitution**: Formally recognizes the "social function of cooperation characterized by mutual aid and not-for-profit motives" and mandates state assistance in safeguarding its development.
- **Indivisible Asset Reserves**: Italian cooperative law mandates that a minimum percentage of net profits (typically 30%) must be placed into indivisible reserves. These reserves are tax-exempt, cannot be distributed to members during the firm's lifetime, and—crucially—upon dissolution or liquidation, must be transferred in full to a national mutual development fund (*Mutualità Cooperativa*) rather than divided among the exiting members. This absolute asset lock removes the incentive to liquidate the cooperative for individual enrichment.
- **The Consortia Architecture**: Italian cooperatives solve scale limitations through secondary and tertiary consortia. Small craft, manufacturing, or farming cooperatives with 20–50 members maintain complete shopfloor democracy while outsourcing sales, marketing, global logistics, and technological research to joint cooperative consortia,

realizing industrial scale economies without corporate consolidation.

- **The Marcora Law (Law 49/1985)**: Provides institutional financing enabling conventional workers facing bankruptcy or factory abandonment to convert their unemployment payouts into lump-sum cooperative startup equity, matched by state venture capital funds (CFI - *Cooperazione Finanza Impresa*).

Despite this sophisticated architecture, scale pathologies emerged in the 2010s, particularly within the massive construction cooperatives (*cooperative di produzione e lavoro*). Enterprises such as **Coopsette** (founded in 1977, carrying thousands of workers), **Unieco**, and **CMC di Ravenna** entered hyper-leveraged balance sheets to compete for public infrastructure projects across Europe, the Middle East, and Africa[33].

The physical and institutional distance between ordinary worker-members and the executive boards transformed these cooperatives into technocratic empires. In the wake of the 2008–2014 Italian infrastructure recession, Coopsette was forced into compulsory administrative liquidation in 2015, Unieco followed in 2017, and CMC di Ravenna filed for crisis restructuring in 2018 under mountains of bad bank debt, proving that indivisible asset reserves cannot protect cooperatives from managerial hubris and commercial bankruptcy when governance scales beyond meaningful member oversight[33].

Scale Ledger: Emilia-Romagna Cooperative Ecosystem

Governance Rung (Scale)	Status	Operational Reality & Historical Failure Threshold
Household (4–10)	Operates	Family-run agrarian farms integrated into local processing cooperatives.
Hamlet / Band (30–50)	Works	Primary agricultural and artisanal co-ops; high trust, peer monitoring, zero alienation.
Village (150–500)	Works	Ideal size for manufacturing units; dense local community embeddedness.
Parish / District (1,500–5,000)	Works	Regional multi-stakeholder social care and educational cooperatives.

Town / Watershed (15,000–50,000)	Works	Networked consortia level; coordinates shared logistics, cold storage, and export sales.
Region / Bioregion (0.5M–5M)	Works	Operates effectively across Emilia-Romagna (4.4M pop); apex bodies negotiate with state.
Nation / Continent (50M–500M)	Degenerates	National apex bodies manage lobbying, but large national cooperatives (construction giants) detached from member oversight and suffered systemic insolvencies.
Planet (8 Billion)	Never Tried	Global engineering projects operated strictly as conventional commercial contracts without extending membership rights to local foreign workforces.

Capture Test: Emilia-Romagna Model

- **Vulnerability**: Machiavellian actors capture secondary and tertiary consortia. Because consortia boards are elected by representatives of representatives, an organized cabal of managerial technocrats can isolate primary cooperative delegates, control agenda access, and engage in high-risk real estate speculation.
- **Historical Manifestation**: The collapse of Coopsette (2015) and Unieco (2017) demonstrated that managerial elites could commit member capital to complex commercial real estate derivatives and global subcontracts while systematically concealing insolvency risks from worker assemblies[33].
- **Counter-Features**: Mandatory external auditing by the apex federations (Legacoop/Confcooperative revision inspections every two years) provides external checks against balance-sheet falsification[32]; the permanent asset lock prevents predatory liquidation by external corporate raiders.

The John Lewis Partnership (United Kingdom)

The John Lewis Partnership (JLP) represents one of the world's oldest and largest commercial models of employee indirect ownership[35]. Comprising John Lewis department stores and Waitrose supermarkets, JLP employs approximately 70,000 to 80,000 permanent workers, all designated as "Partners"[35]. The model was engineered by **John Spedan Lewis**, who inherited the enterprise from his father and subsequently transferred ownership to two irrevocable trust settlements in **1929** and **1950**[35]. Spedan Lewis sought to construct an industrial democracy that shared "knowledge, power, and profit," explicitly designed to eliminate the class warfare between absentee shareholders and exploited wage labor[37].

The governance constitution divides institutional authority among three primary bodies:

- **The Partnership Council**: A representative body of approximately 60 to 70 Partners directly elected by the workforce every three years through secret ballot across regional constituencies[37]. The Council debates operational policies, scrutinizes corporate strategy, approves the Chairman's remuneration, and possesses the constitutional power to dismiss the Chairman by a vote of no confidence[36].
- **The Partnership Board**: The commercial board of directors responsible for long-term fiscal solvency, consisting of executive directors appointed by the Chairman and elected Partner representatives chosen by the Partnership Council[36].
- **The Chairman**: An executive authority appointed through a process initiated by the retiring predecessor, exercising operational control over corporate management[36].
- **The System of Registrars and Partner Counsellors**: An ombudsman structure reporting directly to the Trustees rather than line management, providing a confidential channel for grievance redress and whistleblowing[35].
- **The Gazette**: A weekly in-house print publication that publishes anonymous, unredacted letters and critical inquiries from any worker, obligating senior executives to issue public responses in print.

The Partnership's defining financial mechanism is the **Partnership Bonus**: after capital reinvestment, pension allocations, and reserve funds are set aside, all remaining profits are distributed to every Partner as an identical percentage of their annual base wage, regardless of rank[35].

Despite its durability, JLP demonstrates the structural frictions of modern retail scale. During the 2010s and 2020s, ferocious price competition from Amazon and hard discounters (Aldi, Lidl) squeezed operating margins, forcing the Partnership into consecutive annual operating losses[38]. The Partnership Board took drastic austerity measures: closing dozens of department stores, cutting thousands of staff, terminating the final-salary defined benefit pension scheme in 2020, and suspending the annual Partner Bonus repeatedly between 2020 and 2024[38].

In 2023, Chairwoman Dame Sharon White faced backlash when it leaked that executive leadership was considering selling a minority equity stake (up to 40%) to private equity investors to raise £1 billion in transformation capital. The Partnership Council rebelled, declaring that outside equity breached Spedan Lewis's 1929 Trust Settlements, forcing White to publicly abandon the proposal and announce her resignation, confirming that the Partnership Council

retained a functional veto over constitutional demutualization[37].

Scale Ledger: John Lewis Partnership

Governance Rung (Scale)	Status	Operational Reality & Historical Failure Threshold
Household (4–10)	Operates	Family units sustained by cooperative dividend payouts and employment benefits.
Hamlet / Band (30–50)	Works	Local shop department level; Partner voice exercised directly in daily shift huddles.
Village (150–500)	Works	Single retail branch (Waitrose store); high compliance with constitutional standards.
Parish / District (1,500–5,000)	Works	Large regional department stores (Oxford Street, Peter Jones); local council elections.
Town / Watershed (15,000–50,000)	Works	Consolidated regional distribution networks and multi-store supply networks.
Bioregion (0.5M–5M)	Works	Division-wide operational units across the UK; coordinated logistical integration.
Nation / Continent (50M–500M)	Strained	Scales across the UK (70,000–80,000 Partners); shopfloor workers frequently report alienation

		from distant executive boards despite democratic Council channels.
Planet (8 Billion)	Never Tried	JLP operates strictly within the UK domestic market; foreign goods imported via standard global trade without extending Partner rights to external suppliers.

Capture Test: John Lewis Partnership

- **Vulnerability**: A narcissistic executive maneuvers into the Chairmanship through the traditional patronage nomination channel, surrounds the board with conventional corporate consultants, and gradually marginalizes the Partnership Council by classifying strategic financial negotiations as commercially confidential[36].
- **Historical Manifestation**: The 2022–2023 attempt by Dame Sharon White's leadership team to explore selling equity to external private equity raiders was conducted behind closed doors, almost circumventing the Partnership Council until investigative leaks triggered internal protests.
- **Counter-Features**: The Partnership Council's constitutional right to hold a vote of no confidence and dismiss the Chairman, combined with the independent authority of the Trustees of the Constitution, provides a check against managerial privatization[36].

Raiffeisen Rural Credit Cooperatives (Germany)

The rural credit cooperative movement originated in the Westerwald region of the Rhineland in the **1860s**, engineered by **Friedrich Wilhelm Raiffeisen**, a small-town mayor serving communities devastated by famine, crop failures, and usury[40]. Raiffeisen realized that charitable relief societies (*Hilfsvereine*) were fundamentally paternalistic and financially unsustainable.

In **1862** in Anhausen and **1864** in Heddesdorf, he formed the first self-governing rural credit societies (*Darlehnskassenvereine*)[40]. These institutions were grounded philosophically in the legal and social scholarship of **Otto von Gierke**, whose multi-volume magnum opus *Das deutsche Genossenschaftsrecht* (1868–1913) analyzed the ancient Germanic communal fellowship (*Genossenschaft*) as an organic, self-governing collective body founded on free association, distinct from the coercive, hierarchical dominion (*Herrschaft*) characteristic of Roman law and feudal absolutism[4].

The institutional design of the early Raiffeisen model relied on strict governance constraints:

- **Unlimited Mutual Joint Liability (*Solidarhaftung*)**: Every member was personally liable to the full extent of their private property for all loans issued by the cooperative. This radical liability regime made default catastrophic for the entire community.

- **Geographic Hyper-Localization**: Membership was strictly confined to a single ecclesiastical parish or rural commune (typically 200–500 individuals). Because members lived in close proximity, asymmetric information was eliminated; neighbors knew each borrower's character, work habits, and harvest prospects, relying on social sanctions to enforce repayment without professional debt collectors.
- **Honorary Management (*Ehrenamt*)**: Board members and credit examiners were forbidden from receiving salaries or bonuses, preventing self-dealing and careerist bureaucratization. Only the cashier (*Rendant*) received a modest operational stipend.
- **Indivisible Reserve Capital**: Surpluses were never distributed as dividends. They were transferred directly into an indivisible capital fund (*Stiftungsvermögen*) designed to absorb loan defaults, lower future interest rates, and ensure the bank's intergenerational autonomy.

The Raiffeisen model proved resilient against localized agricultural shocks and scaled across Europe. However, its institutional expansion precipitated a classic structural degeneration. As credit unions federated into regional clearing banks and ultimately into the national **DZ Bank** (now the second-largest banking system in Germany), the requirements of modern central banking systematically dismantled the founding principles:

1. The 1889 German Cooperative Act (*Genossenschaftsgesetz*) permitted limited liability, neutralizing the visceral discipline of *Solidarhaftung*[41].
2. Parish boundaries were erased through consecutive waves of corporate mergers. In Germany, thousands of independent village credit societies were consolidated into large regional institutions.
3. Professional management replaced voluntary honorary boards, converting local democratic assemblies into passive depositor meetings.

Today, while the Raiffeisen brand retains immense banking market share, the institutions operate as commercial, deposit-taking universal banks. The primary depositor-member exerts almost zero direct democratic oversight over the complex derivative books and capital allocations of the central federated banking entities.

Scale Ledger: Raiffeisen Credit Cooperatives

Governance Rung (Scale)	Status	Operational Reality & Historical Failure Threshold
Household (4–10)	Operates	Peasant domestic units pledged aggregate family assets to obtain credit.
Hamlet / Band (30–50)	Works	Original Westerwald micro-associations; complete transparency, zero defaulting.

Village (150–500)	Works	The optimal historical Raiffeisen parish cell; moral hazard eliminated via peer monitoring.
Parish / District (1,500–5,000)	Works	Multi-village credit unions with elected audit committees; operated effectively 1890–1950.
Town / Watershed (15,000–50,000)	Works	Regional cooperative unions managing mutual insurance pools and agricultural supplies.
Bioregion (0.5M–5M)	Strained	Requires tiered federal clearing houses; professionalization displaces honorary boards.
Nation / Continent (50M–500M)	Degenerates	Consolidated central banks (DZ Bank); democratic member governance is rendered nominal; institutions behave identically to commercial capitalist financial conglomerates.
Planet (8 Billion)	Never Tried	Global exposure exists only through conventional international banking inter-lending channels, completely uncoupled from cooperative membership rights.

Capture Test: Raiffeisen Model

- **Vulnerability**: A predatory financial manager takes advantage of the transition from

honorary village management to professional regional banking. By exploiting the mathematical complexity of fractional-reserve inter-lending and bond underwriting, the manager insulates commercial lending operations from rural parish oversight[34].

- **Historical Manifestation**: Late-twentieth-century cooperative bank consolidations in Germany and Austria saw regional executives divert agricultural capital into high-risk global real estate and foreign exchange speculation, forcing the central cooperative federations to bail out insolvent branches.
- **Counter-Features**: The historical Raiffeisen counter-measure was the mandatory, independent regional audit federations (*Prüfungsverbände*). These regional federations retained statutory authority to conduct surprise, in-depth book audits of local credit societies, immediately revoking operating charters upon the discovery of speculative embezzlement[41].

The Amul / Anand Model (India)

The Anand model of dairy cooperatives is one of the largest smallholder agrarian organizations in human history[44]. Anchored by the brand **Amul** and federated under the **Gujarat Cooperative Milk Marketing Federation (GCMMF)**, the system encompasses more than 3.6 million farmer-members across 18,600 village societies in Gujarat, procuring upwards of 25–30 million liters of milk daily[44].

The enterprise originated in **1946** in Anand (Kaira District, Gujarat) as a farmer revolt against the monopoly pricing of Polson Dairy, which held exclusive municipal milk supply contracts with the colonial British government in Bombay[44]. Advised by independence leader Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, local farmers led by **Tribhuvandas Patel** formed the Kaira District Cooperative Milk Producers' Union[44].

In **1949**, **Dr. Verghese Kurien**, a Cornell-educated metallurgical engineer on government deputation, joined the cooperative, followed by dairy engineer **H.M. Dalaya**[44]. Dalaya developed the breakthrough industrial process for converting buffalo milk into skim milk powder and condensed milk, breaking the commercial monopoly held by Western dairy conglomerates (Nestlé, Glaxo) and establishing the technical foundation for India's **Operation Flood** (1970–1996), which transformed India from a milk-deficit nation into the world's leading milk producer[44].

The Anand structure operates as a three-tier nested federation[44]:

- **Tier 1: Village Dairy Cooperative Societies (VDCS)**: The foundational tier located in individual villages, comprising 100 to 500 local farmers, smallholders, and landless laborers[44]. Every member who delivers a minimum volume of milk (typically 50–100 liters per year) has one vote in the annual village general assembly, which elects a local management committee[44]. Twice daily, members bring milk to the village center, where it is analyzed using electronic fat-testing equipment, and receive immediate cash payments based transparently on fat and solids-not-fat content[44].
- **Tier 2: District Cooperative Milk Producers' Unions**: Village societies within a geographic district federate to own a central district union (such as the Kaira Union or Banaskantha Union)[44]. The district union owns and operates large-scale industrial dairy

processing plants, cattle feed manufacturing factories, and mobile veterinary networks providing subsidized veterinary care and artificial insemination services[44].

- **Tier 3: The State Milk Marketing Federation (GCMMF)**: The district unions collectively own and govern the state-level federation, which is responsible for corporate branding, national advertising, cold-chain logistics, and the marketing of finished dairy products across domestic and international markets[44].

The Anand model is structurally pro-poor: dairy participation is land-neutral; landless households can maintain one or two buffaloes fed on crop residues and common forage, converting family labor into immediate cash flow[44].

However, scaling to millions of producers generated deep political and managerial capture pressures. The ultimate institutional crisis erupted in **March 2006**, when Dr. Verghese Kurien was forced out of the chairmanship of the GCMMF after 34 years of tenure[46]. The board of the GCMMF, composed of the chairmen of the district unions, voted to move a no-confidence motion against Kurien[46].

Kurien, who had served as a benevolent paternalistic autocrat for five decades, had resisted the encroachment of political parties into the cooperative structure[46]. Following his departure, the multi-tier cooperative governance network was increasingly drawn into electoral politics: elections for district milk union boards became battlegrounds between the ruling Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) and the Indian National Congress, with political parties mobilizing state regulatory powers, registrar interventions, and patronage appointments to secure control over the federation's multibillion-rupee cash flows and milk procurement routes[46].

The technical architecture constructed by Kurien and Dalaya remains operational and commercially dominant, but its democratic insulation from state and political capture has degraded[46].

Scale Ledger: The Anand / Amul Model

Governance Rung (Scale)	Status	Operational Reality & Historical Failure Threshold
Household (4–10)	Works	Household family labor manages animal care; daily milk payouts fund basic sustenance.
Hamlet / Band (30–50)	Works	Small pastoral collection points; high direct oversight over milk freshness.
Village (150–500)	Works	The Village Dairy Cooperative Society

		(VDCS); direct assembly voting, automated testing.
Parish / District (1,500–5,000)	Works	Sub-district chilling stations and veterinary coverage routes.
Town / Watershed (15,000–50,000)	Works	Multi-village milk collection routes feeding into district processing plants.
Bioregion (0.5M–5M)	Works	District Unions (e.g., Kaira, Banas) coordinating thousands of villages and feed plants.
Nation / Continent (50M–500M)	Strained	GCMMF and national Operation Flood network; commercially supreme, but vulnerable to partisan political capture and bureaucratic central state meddling.
Planet (8 Billion)	Degenerates	International marketing operates via standard export trade; overseas consumers and multinational distributors operate completely outside cooperative governance.

Capture Test: Amul / Anand Model

- **Vulnerability**: State political party apparatuses capture district union boards. By buying off village headmen or leveraging state registrar oversight over cooperative registration rules, political factions install loyalist directors who use cooperative procurement pricing and employment contracts as patronage resources.
- **Historical Manifestation**: The 2006 boardroom coup against Verghese Kurien and the subsequent partisan political battles for control of the Banaskantha and Mehsana district

milk unions proved that when cooperative revenue becomes equivalent to a state's commercial lifeblood, regional political elites will deploy state powers to break autonomous governance[46].

- **Counter-Features**: Immediate twice-daily computerized testing of milk fat content and instant cash disbursement provide transparency at the base; if district politicians artificially reduce milk payouts, smallholder farmers immediately protest or divert milk supplies to local grey-market vendors[44].

The Israeli Kibbutzim: From Communitarian Socialism to Privatization

The Israeli kibbutz movement represents the most radical and durable attempt in modern history to sustain comprehensive, non-market, communitarian egalitarianism[53]. Emerging from the second and third *Aliyah* waves in Ottoman and Mandatory Palestine—crystallized by the founding of Degania in **1910**—the kibbutzim were intentional rural communes constructed on land leased from the Jewish National Fund[5]. As documented extensively by historian **Henry Near** in *The Kibbutz Movement: A History* (Vols. 1 & 2), the classic kibbutz systematically dismantled the institutional apparatus of private capitalism and the nuclear family:

- Private property was abolished; all productive assets, land, and capital goods were owned collectively[5].
- Members were compensated according to the classical communist maxim: *from each according to their ability, to each according to their need*[5]. No member received wages; the kibbutz provided food, communal housing, clothing, healthcare, education, and shared child-rearing in specialized "children's houses" (*batei yeladim*)[53].
- Governance was executed through radical direct democracy: the weekly **General Assembly (*Asefa Klalit*)** was the sovereign arbiter of all internal disputes, economic allocations, higher-education permissions, and production assignments, operating with mandatory rotation of executive offices (*Mazkir*, *Merakez Meshek*) to prevent the crystallization of an administrative oligarchy[5].

In *The Mystery of the Kibbutz: Egalitarian Principles in a Capitalist World* (2018), economist **Ran Abramitzky** provided the foundational microeconomic explanation for both the prolonged survival and the eventual privatization of the kibbutz movement[58]:

- **The Mutual Insurance Model**: In their pioneering phase (1910–1970), complete income equality survived not merely due to ideological socialist fervor, but because it provided indispensable **mutual insurance** against severe idiosyncratic risks (malaria, crop failure, military conflict, physical disability) in a hostile frontier environment where state and commercial insurance markets were completely absent[58].
- **Mitigation of Moral Hazard and Adverse Selection**: In small, ideologically homogeneous communities (100–300 members), social surveillance, deep mutual familiarity, and powerful cultural sanctions against shirking mitigated the moral hazard inherent in divorcing labor effort from personal income[58]. Adverse selection was blocked by rigorous multi-year candidate screening, long probationary periods, and an intentional entry barrier: by forfeiting all personal property upon admission, joining members proved their ideological commitment[58].

The structural collapse of the classic egalitarian model was triggered by two converging forces: macroeconomic shocks and changing opportunity costs[53].

In **1985**, the Israeli government introduced its Economic Stabilization Plan to curb triple-digit hyperinflation[5]. Kibbutzim had borrowed heavily from state-adjacent commercial banks during the late 1970s and early 1980s to finance aggressive industrialization and living-standard upgrades[5].

When the central bank jacked real interest rates upward, the entire kibbutz movement was thrown into immediate collective bankruptcy, with debt liabilities exceeding $4 billion[5]. Inability to meet financial obligations collapsed internal trust in the leadership elite[56].

Concurrently, Israel's external economy evolved from an agrarian-industrial state into a high-technology capitalist powerhouse[58]. High-ability, highly educated kibbutz youth faced massive opportunity costs: while an egalitarian kibbutz offered identical living standards to all, the external private labor market offered elite wages to engineers, software developers, and managers[58].

Abramitzky demonstrated empirically that kibbutzim suffered severe **adverse selection (brain drain)**: the most talented, skilled, and educated individuals departed for the cities, while less productive, older, and dependent members remained behind[58].

To halt demographic and financial collapse, the overwhelming majority of kibbutzim (~75% to 80% by 2010) voted democratically to abandon equal sharing and privatize internal services[53]:

1. **The "Safety Net" Model (*Ha-Model Ha-Meshulav / Model Ha-Reshet*)**: They abandoned communal accounting, allowing members to retain market-determined differential wages[53]. A progressive internal "kibbutz tax" was levied on wages to fund a guaranteed baseline safety net for elderly, sick, and low-earning members[53].
2. **Asset and Housing Privatization**: Communal dining halls were closed or converted to pay-per-meal systems; apartments, electricity, and utilities were privatized; and home titles were deeded directly to individual families[53].
3. **Governance Professionalization**: The sovereign weekly *Asefa Klalit* was replaced by appointed boards of directors and professional managers, while production units increasingly relied on external hired wage labor (such as Thai agricultural workers and Arab industrial labor)[57].

The kibbutz successfully avoided physical extinction by transforming itself into an affluent, privatized suburban cooperative with a robust local welfare fund, proving that comprehensive non-market income equality cannot survive within an open society when exit costs fall and external returns to human capital surge[53].

Scale Ledger: The Israeli Kibbutz

Governance Rung (Scale)	Status	Operational Reality & Historical Failure Threshold
Household (4–10)	Operates	Originally suppressed via

		communal children's houses; later reasserted as primary unit.
Hamlet / Band (30–50)	Works	Early *Kvutzot* (e.g., early Degania); perfect informal direct democracy, zero shirking.
Village (150–500)	Works (Hist.)	Classic operational scale of agricultural/industrial kibbutz (1920–1980); viable through intense social surveillance; collapsed when external opportunity costs diverged.
Parish / District (1,500–5,000)	Strained	Regional kibbutz federations sharing packing plants and tractors; succumbed to financial leverage shocks during the 1985 crisis.
Town / Watershed (15,000–50,000)	Never Tried	Never operated as an integrated communal egalitarian polity at this scale; units remained autonomous agricultural-industrial enclaves.
Bioregion (0.5M–5M)	Fails	Federation level (Kibbutz Artzi, Takam) managed political and debt negotiations but was unable to prevent macro adverse selection across Israeli society.

Nation / Continent (50M–500M)	Never Tried	Kibbutzim represented only 2–3% of Israel's total population; sustained via initial state land concessions and protectionist agricultural subsidies.
Planet (8 Billion)	Never Tried	Ideologically insular; communes rejected open planetary membership to prevent the dilution of cultural and communal solidarity.

Capture Test: Israeli Kibbutz

- **Vulnerability**: During the early egalitarian phase, ideological gatekeepers captured the nominating committees (*Va'adat Minuyim*), using social stigma and ostracism to silence members who raised questions about financial over-leveraging. In the post-privatization phase, external professional managers capture corporate assets, leveraging their operational knowledge to negotiate outsized compensation contracts while converting communal assets into private shares.
- **Historical Manifestation**: Sociological investigations by Menachem Topel (*The Changing Composition of Kibbutz Elites*) documented how a technocratic "managerial elite" engineered the transition to differential wages, positioning themselves as the primary beneficiaries of privatized enterprise boards while stripping the traditional General Assembly of its budgeting power[57].
- **Counter-Features**: The historical counter-feature was mandatory office rotation (*Tovat Ha-Meshek*), which routinely demoted high-status managers back to kitchen or agricultural labor after three to five years, completely purging emerging managerial oligarchies[5]. The abandonment of mandatory rotation in the 1970s directly precipitated managerial entrenchment.

4. Systematic Comparative Synthesis

Threefold Separation Analysis

To disentangle institutional mythology from operational reality, this report distinguishes three layers of truth across the analyzed cases:

1. **What the Arrangement's People Said It Did** (Internal ideology and official declarations)[13].
2. **What the Historical Record Shows It Did** (Empirically documented institutional

behavior)[5].

3. **What Modern Scholarship Infers** (Econometric, theoretical, and institutional conclusions)[1].

Arrangement	1. Internal Declarations (What People Said It Did)	2. Historical Record (What the Record Shows It Did)	3. Modern Scholarship (What Scholarship Infers)
Mondragon Corporation (1956–Present)	"Subordination of capital to labor; universal solidarity; non-hierarchical participatory democracy"[13].	Deployed €300M in solidarity funds to delay Fagor's 2013 fall; then let it fail; absorbed 1,895 worker-owners; generated 100+ foreign capitalist plants[23].	Operates as a dual-tier "hybrid coopitalist multinational": strong Basque democratic core preserved by exploiting unfranchised foreign wage labor[24].
Emilia-Romagna Consortia (1947–Present)	"Anti-capitalist mutual aid; decentralized artisanal self-determination; labor liberation"[32].	Built dominant regional food and retail networks; large construction co-ops collapsed in 2015–2018 under speculative debts[33].	Indivisible reserves solve horizon problems, but secondary consortia create agency gaps that replicate conventional corporate pathologies at scale[7].
John Lewis Partnership (1929–Present)	"Sharing knowledge, power, and profit; industrial democracy abolishing worker-owner conflict"[37].	Council exercises veto over asset sales; shopfloor alienation grew; bonuses slashed to 0% during retail margin crises[36].	Trust ownership protects from hostile takeovers, but absence of equity access generates capital starvation in hyper-competitive

			markets[36].
Raiffeisen Credit Cooperatives (1862–Present)	"Christian personalist solidarity; mutual aid without profit motives; pure local parish autonomy"[40].	Eliminated rural usury; transformed into standard commercial banking conglomerations (DZ Bank) through mergers[41].	Unlimited liability solved local monitoring costs, but regulatory consolidation inevitably triggers Michelsian oligarchical decay[4].
Amul / Anand Model (1946–Present)	"Farmer self-empowerment; land-neutral democratic poverty eradication"[44].	Broke Western milk monopolies; built world's largest dairy supply; board ousted Kurien in 2006 for state-party patronage[46].	Three-tier federalism successfully matches smallholder production to urban scale, but deep capital flows attract state-level political capture[44].
Israeli Kibbutzim (1910–Present)	"From each according to ability, to each according to need; the vanguard of non-state socialist humanity"[5].	Maintained equal sharing for 75 years; 80% privatized into differential wage schemes after 1985 crisis[53].	Equal sharing functioned as mutual insurance; collapsed when high external opportunity costs drove brain drain of educated high-ability youth[58].

The Strongest Case Against: Leading Critics and Theoretical Foundations

To establish an unsparing analysis of cooperative systems, their performance must be assessed against their most formidable critics:

- **The Problem of Metering and Monitoring (Alchian & Demsetz, 1972)**: When workers own their own enterprise, they have an incentive to free-ride on the physical effort of peers unless an external, specialized monitor exists who possesses the residual claim on net assets. Democratic peer monitoring breaks down as group size expands past small face-to-face bands, resulting in either falling productivity or the creation of invasive, bureaucratic monitoring systems that poison internal community morale[6].

- **The Horizon and Portfolio Problem (Jensen & Meckling, 1979)**: Workers are structurally incapable of rational financial capital allocation because their claims cannot be diversified across capital markets. A conventional investor holds a diversified portfolio across dozens of industries; a worker-owner has both their human capital (labor income) and financial capital (retirement account) tied up in a single firm[6]. Worker-owners are therefore structurally risk-averse regarding bold research and development, yet paradoxically prone to asset-stripping their own firm via short-term bonus distributions if they perceive an economic downturn[6].
- **The Cost of Collective Decision-Making (Hansmann, 1996)**: Henry Hansmann showed that the fundamental reason investor-owned firms dominate the global economy is not their access to physical capital, but their radical **governance homogeneity**: investors share a single, mathematically clean objective—the maximization of net present value of cash flows. Workers, by contrast, possess conflicting preferences: older workers demand absolute job security, unvarying wages, and pension protections; younger workers demand risky capital reinvestment, technological modernization, and wage dispersion based on individual productivity[62]. These divergent internal preferences make democratic decision costs explode exponentially with firm size, leading to operational paralysis, institutional gridlock, or divisive factional infighting.
- **The Inevitability of Degeneration (The Webbs 1897; Oppenheimer 1896)**: A financially successful cooperative faces the mathematical reality that admitting new workers dilutes the average surplus share of incumbent founders[2]. Therefore, successful worker cooperatives either close membership and rely on hired wage labor, or are purchased by conventional capitalist acquirers, confirming that worker cooperatives cannot survive in a competitive market without devolving into either capitalist employers or failed workshops[1].

5. Summary, Open Questions, and Foundational Literature

Ten-Line Summary of Robust Findings

1. Worker cooperatives do not suffer from systematically higher business failure rates; empirical panels demonstrate annual hazard rates 20% to 29% lower than conventional capitalist firms[7].
2. Faced with macroeconomic shocks, worker cooperatives systematically prioritize employment stability over wage preservation, using democratic pay variability as an operational safety valve[2].
3. Undercapitalization is not an inevitable fatal defect; it is neutralized by institutional asset locks and mandatory indivisible reserve funds[7].
4. Total factor productivity and labor efficiency in labor-managed firms match or exceed investor-owned peers due to reduced supervisory overhead and horizontal peer monitoring[6].
5. Direct workplace democracy operates with high cohesion at the village and plant scale

(50–500 individuals), but faces sharp alienation and managerial delegation beyond 1,500 individuals[5].

6. Scaled industrial cooperatives maintain regional survival by creating hybrid networks: preserving a democratic regional core while managing foreign subsidiaries through conventional capitalist wage labor[24].
7. Large multi-tiered federations risk bureaucratic alienation and secession if high-performing units perceive central solidarity levies as an uncompensated tax on their autonomy[23].
8. Comprehensive non-market income equality operates effectively as a mutual insurance scheme against severe risks, but collapses when external economic opportunities create brain-drain exit pressures[58].
9. The elimination of external equity holders does not eradicate dark-triad capture; Machiavellian actors exploit information asymmetries in the gap between representative councils and professional management[34].
10. Cooperative durability depends on external institutional nesting—cooperative banks, apex auditing federations, and technical schools—rather than the isolated moral virtue of individual worker-members[18].

Contested or Open Questions

1. **The Global Expansion Dilemma**: Can an industrial worker cooperative maintain its international market share without establishing capitalist subsidiaries or relying on unfranchised foreign wage labor[24]?
2. **The True Horizon Limits**: In the complete absence of state subsidies, legal asset-lock enforcement, and modern banking systems, can a cooperative entity prevent retiring members from liquidating its capital base[6]?
3. **Optimal Internal Wage Compression**: What is the empirical upper boundary of wage compression (e.g., 1:3 vs. 1:9) that permits a cooperative to retain world-class technical, administrative, and engineering specialists without inducing adverse-selection departures[15]?
4. **The Long-Term Stability of Consortia**: Do secondary and tertiary consortia inevitably transform into self-serving managerial oligarchies that detach from the primary base cooperatives[33]?
5. **Direct Assembly Scalability**: Can physical assembly direct democracy survive without devolving into a "rule by notables" once the political community expands beyond Dunbar's number (~150) to the parish scale (1,500–5,000)[5]?

Key Foundational Literature

1. **Abramitzky, Ran (2018)**. *The Mystery of the Kibbutz: Egalitarian Principles in a Capitalist World*. Princeton University Press. (The definitive modern microeconomic analysis of equality, risk insurance, adverse selection, and privatization)[58].
2. **Burdín, Gabriel (2014)**. "Are Worker-Managed Firms Less Likely to Fail than Conventional Enterprises? Evidence from Uruguay." *ILR Review*, 67(3), 821–852. (The most robust econometric paper confirming superior survival rates among worker cooperatives)[7].

3. **Craig, Ben, and John Pencavel (1992)**. "The Behavior of Worker Cooperatives: The Plywood Companies of the Pacific Northwest." *American Economic Review*, 82(5), 1083–1105. (The foundational empirical refutation of the classical economic models of worker firm instability)[8].
4. **Gierke, Otto von (1868–1913)**. *Das deutsche Genossenschaftsrecht* (4 Volumes). Weidmann. (The foundational philosophical and legal treatise establishing the distinction between organic cooperative self-governance and hierarchical state domination)[41].
5. **Hansmann, Henry (1996)**. *The Ownership of Enterprise*. Harvard University Press. (The landmark transaction-cost analysis establishing the role of member preference homogeneity in institutional survival).
6. **Near, Henry (1992, 1997)**. *The Kibbutz Movement: A History* (Vol. 1: Origins and Growth; Vol. 2: Crisis and Achievement). Littman Library of Jewish Civilization. (The definitive, two-volume historical record of the kibbutz movement's institutional lifecycle)[5].
7. **Pérotin, Virginie (2016)**. *What Do We Really Know About Workers' Cooperatives?* Co-operatives UK Report. (An exhaustive cross-national empirical survey synthesizing European data on productivity, investment, and firm scale)[7].
8. **Webb, Sidney, and Beatrice Webb (1897)**. *Industrial Democracy*. Longmans, Green & Co. (The classical articulation of the cooperative degeneration thesis)[1].
9. **Whyte, William Foote, and Kathleen King Whyte (1991)**. *Making Mondragon: The Growth and Dynamics of the Worker Cooperative Complex*. Cornell University Press. (The foundational ethnographic and organizational case study of the Basque complex).

6. Implementability after the Fall

Low-Tech Reconstruction Parameters (No State, Grid, or Internet)

In an environment characterized by the permanent collapse of industrial supply chains, electrical distribution grids, digital telecommunications, and state enforcement, cooperative enterprise ceases to be a theoretical alternative to capitalism; it becomes the primary mechanism for pooling labor and physical survival assets. Without external courts or central banks, cooperative survival depends on transparent physical accounting, face-to-face peer monitoring, and nested federal assemblies.

The Household Scale (4 to 10 People)

At the household rung, the cooperative operates as a domestic survival commune based on total income and consumption pooling. Productive effort is allocated daily by informal mutual agreement, with labor divided along lines of physical strength, skill, and domestic care. The asset base consists of hand tools, foraging territory, seed stocks, and residential shelter. Prerequisites are minimal: basic familial or affective bonds, shared oral agreements, and a central domestic hearth.

The primary structural failure to expect at this scale is despotic patriarchal or physical tyranny. In the complete absence of external legal recourse, domestic units are highly vulnerable to narcissism and violent domination by physically powerful or sociopathic household heads, reducing weaker members to unfranchised domestic serfs.

The Village Scale (300 People)

At the village rung of approximately 300 individuals, the optimal institutional form is the primary agricultural and defense cooperative, closely mirroring the historical Raiffeisen parish bank and the early kibbutz. Land, grain storage, draft animals, defensive stockades, and water mills are held as an indivisible communal asset (*Stiftungsvermögen*).

Governance is conducted through the weekly **Village General Assembly**, gathering every adult member (*one person, one vote*). The Assembly elects an executive **Governing Council** of five rotating officers: an agricultural director, master mechanic/miller, defensive captain, quartermaster, and an independent ombudsman.

Surpluses are accounted for using a physical labor-credit or "bushel-ledger" system. Every member owes mandatory physical labor shifts to common fields and defensive watches. Individual consumption grain is disbursed based on hours worked, with a mandatory 30% deduction permanently allocated to an indivisible reserve granary to buffer against crop blight, drought, or siege.

Prerequisites to initiate this system include:

- **Literacy and Numeracy**: A minimum of three to five individuals literate and competent in double-entry bookkeeping.
- **Physical Records**: A bound, parchment or rag-paper ledger (*The Village Ledger*), secured in a physical chest requiring two separate keys held simultaneously by the quartermaster and the ombudsman. Every deposit of grain, birth of livestock, tool loan, and watchman shift must be recorded publicly in ink before assembled witnesses.
- **A Shared Calendar**: A central sundial, mechanical clock, or iron signal gong to divide the working day, linked to an agricultural-lunar calendar to coordinate plowing, sowing, harvest rotations, and assembly meetings.
- **A Meeting Hall**: A covered physical structure (such as an intact chapel, masonry barn, or schoolhouse) capable of holding all 300 adults for weekly deliberations.

The first structural failure to expect at this rung is **effort shirking and moral hazard in communal field labor**. As the initial post-collapse existential terror recedes, individual households will begin withholding effort during labor shifts, feigning illness, or secretly hoarding grain from common plots. If the Village Assembly relies exclusively on moral exhortation rather than transparent ledger audits and social sanctions (such as public censure, fines in grain rations, or expulsion), resentment will fracture the community, leading high-effort families to demand the partition and privatization of village lands.

The District Scale (3,000 People / ~10 Villages)

At the district rung encompassing approximately ten distinct villages, the institutional form is the secondary cooperative consortium, modeled on the Anand dairy federation and the Emilia-Romagna consortia. Individual villages retain complete internal autonomy over their fields, domestic housing, and local assembly rules, but federate upward to operate capital-intensive, high-specialization assets: a blast furnace and iron foundry, specialized grain and oil mills, a central hospital and apothecary, an armory, and a long-range defensive militia.

Governance is vested in the **District Senate**, a representative assembly composed of two recallable delegates elected by each of the ten village assemblies. Delegates serve strictly limited one-year terms and operate under **imperative mandates** (they are legally bound to vote according to written resolutions passed by their home village assemblies). The Senate

appoints a District Quartermaster and a Chief Engineer, who can be removed at any time by a vote of no confidence supported by four or more village delegations.
To ensure accountability across geographic space, the District institutes an independent **Auditing Guild** of three rotating scribes who travel continuously between villages, verifying granary reserves, inspecting border boundary markers, and auditing village ledgers against central district clearing accounts.
Prerequisites to initiate this system include:

- **Communications and Transit Infrastructure**: Maintained pack-mule paths or navigable waterways connecting all ten village centers, serviced by a weekly courier network delivering written dispatches, trade prices, and security warnings.
- **Standardized Weights and Measures**: Physical primary standards (such as bronze balance weights and verified wooden dry-bushel vessels) cast and kept under guard at the District Senate storehouse, against which every village measuring device is calibrated annually.
- **A Neutral Deliberative Center**: A centrally located assembly compound equipped with sleeping quarters, grain storehouses, and a defensible council hall.

The first structural failure to expect at this rung is **centrifugal secession by resource-rich villages**. Villages possessing favorable downstream river access, functioning water mills, or superior alluvial soil will grow resentful of transferring grain, iron, or labor to sustain upland defense stations or poorer settlements (mirroring the 2022 secession of ULMA and Orona from Mondragon). Local Machiavellian leaders will exploit this grievance, depicting the District Senate as an extractive, parasitical central state and agitating to sever federal ties, hoard local surpluses, and reduce cooperative mutual aid to a weak military alliance.

7. Principles

1. **Refuted**: A productive enterprise governed by its worker-members is inherently doomed to commercial insolvency and premature operational collapse.
2. **Supported**: Enterprises that link compensation to democratically determined net surplus volatility preserve employment stability across severe macroeconomic shocks more effectively than investor-owned enterprises.
3. **Supported**: The retention of capital within indivisible, legally locked communal reserves neutralizes the Jensen-Meckling horizon problem and secures capital accumulation across generational turnover.
4. **Supported**: Horizontal peer monitoring among worker-owners reduces supervisory overhead and achieves total factor productivity equal to or higher than hierarchy-driven management structures in production units of fewer than 500 individuals.
5. **Supported**: Expanding an enterprise's operational scale beyond 1,500 individuals transforms direct assembly democracy into representative council oversight, creating an agency gap between technocratic managers and frontline labor.
6. **Supported**: When a cooperative enterprise expands across international borders without extending voting equity and ownership rights to foreign workers, its outer operations degenerate into conventional wage-labor extraction.
7. **Supported**: Large multi-tier cooperative federations fracture when high-performing

industrial subunits perceive centralized solidarity levies as an uncompensated extraction of their local surpluses.

8. **Supported**: Comprehensive non-market income equality functions as an insurance mechanism during high-risk founding phases, but suffers brain-drain departures when external labor markets offer high returns to human capital.
9. **Refuted**: The eradication of external equity holders eliminates the emergence of managerial oligarchies and dark-triad institutional capture.
10. **Supported**: Direct democratic self-governance cannot scale beyond Dunbar's boundary unless primary self-governing cells are nested upward into secondary federations through recallable delegates holding imperative mandates.

Works cited

1. The Degeneration Debate: Strategical Considerations for the Worker, https://www.socialenterprisehub.ca/cooperatives/the-degeneration-debate-strategical-considerations-for-the-worker-co-operative-movement
2. Worker cooperatives and democratic governance - EconStor, https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/67218/1/728401401.pdf
3. The degeneration of workers' cooperatives under endogenous, https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/300149/1/1885668899.pdf
4. Werner Kruck: "Transformationsgesetz" und Wirklichkeit der, https://www.franz-oppenheimer.de/kruck/wk92a.htm
5. Renewal of the Kibbutz - Rah's Open Lid, https://www.rahs-open-lid.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/Russell-Raymond-Robert-Hanneman-and-Shlomo-Getz-The-Renewal-of-the-Kibbutz_-From-Reform-to-Transformation-Rutgers-University-Press-2013.pdf
6. A Comparison of Worker Cooperatives and Conventional Firms in, https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/1995/01/1995_bpeamicro_craig.pdf
7. What do we really know about worker co-operatives?, http://efesonline.org/LIBRARY/2016/worker_co-op_report.pdf
8. The Behavior of Worker Cooperatives: The Plywood Companies of, https://econpapers.repec.org/RePEc:aea:aecrev:v:82:y:1992:i:5:p:1083-105
9. John Pencavel - Google Scholar, https://scholar.google.com/citations?user=tVzqot8AAAAJ&hl=en
10. (PDF) What Do We Really Know About Workers' Cooperatives?*, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285356334_What_Do_We_Really_Know_About_Workers'_Cooperatives
11. The objectives of worker cooperatives - Pencavel, John - PortailCoop, https://portailcoop.hec.ca/notice?id=h%3A%3A23b54534-83da-438a-80ce-3b615d6e85cf&locale=fr
12. Worker Cooperatives: Good, Sustainable Jobs in the Community*, https://euricse.eu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/perotinultimo.pdf
13. The Mondragon Worker Cooperatives' Employment Record 1983, https://brill.com/view/journals/jlso/26/3/article-p336_003.xml

14. Worker Cooperatives and Democratic Governance - IDEAS/RePEc, https://ideas.repec.org/p/sip/dpaper/12-003.html
15. Mondragon Corporation - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mondragon_Corporation
16. Mondragón Co-operative Corporation: Participatory Business, https://participedia.net/case/82
17. WIKI n°20: Mondragon Cooperatives Governance Model – Spain, https://www.ires.ma/iip/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/WIKI-n%C2%B020-Mondragon-Cooperatives-Governance-Model-%E2%80%93-Spain.pdf
18. (PDF) The Mondragon Experience - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/320016464_The_Mondragon_Experience
19. The Mondragon Worker Cooperatives' Employment Record 1983, https://brill.com/view/journals/jlso/26/3/article-p336_003.xml?language=en
20. What do you think about The Mondragon Corporation? : r/Marxism, https://www.reddit.com/r/Marxism/comments/1iy2863/what_do_you_think_about_the_mondragon_corporation/
21. Corporate Governance and the Mondragón cooperatives, https://e-archivo.uc3m.es/bitstreams/312c865b-e36c-4505-be06-381c39008b18/download
22. Worker Cooperatives in a Globalizing World - Great Transition Initiative, https://greattransition.org/publication/worker-cooperatives/
23. Overcoming Barriers of Employee Ownership in France, Italy, Spain, https://research-api.cbs.dk/ws/portalfiles/portal/99102627/niels_mygind_overcoming_barriers_of_employee_ownership_acceptedversion.pdf
24. The Fall of the Mondragon Cooperative Fagor - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/313292439_The_Viability_of_Cooperatives_The_Fall_of_the_Mondragon_Cooperative_Fagor
25. Workers occupy plant as Spanish co-operative goes under, https://www.theguardian.com/social-enterprise-network/2013/nov/15/spanish-co-op-workers-occupy-plant
26. ANNUAL REPORT - MONDRAGON Corporation, https://www.mondragon-corporation.com/wp-content/themes/mondragon/docs/eng/annual-report-2013.pdf
27. New trouble for Mondragon as two industrial co-ops leave the fold, https://www.thenews.coop/new-trouble-for-mondragon-as-two-industrial-co-ops-leave-the-fold/
28. Two Coops Leave the Mondragon Corporation, https://www.nceo.org/employee-ownership-blog/two-coops-leave-mondragon-corporation
29. Mondragon Corporation Facts for Kids, https://kids.kiddle.co/Mondragon_Corporation
30. REBUILDING THE SOCIAL ECONOMY IN ROMANIA ON THE, https://www.jppc.ro/index.php/jppc/article/download/1084/504
31. Mondragon Corporation: How to Research It with AI Without Getting,

https://www.qwe.edu.pl/tutorial/mondragon-corporation-ai-case-study/
32. Legacoop Emilia-Romagna, https://www.digaccess-agrotourism.eu/farmhouses/legacoop-emilia-romagna
33. CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AND ... - ITINERA S.p.A., https://www.itinera-spa.it/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/BILANCIO-ITINERA-2018-ENG-1.pdf
34. Dark Triad Managerial Personality and Financial Reporting, https://en.wiwi.uni-paderborn.de/fileadmin-wiwi/cetar/TAF_Working_Paper_Series/TAF_WP_056_MutschmannHassoPelster2020_rev.pdf
35. John Lewis Plc About Us Marketing Essay | UKEssays.com, https://www.ukessays.com/essays/marketing/john-lewis-plc-about-us-marketing-essay.php
36. John Lewis Partnership lessons in logical incrementalism and, https://www.emerald.com/jsma/article/5/1/103/256129/John-Lewis-Partnership-lessons-in-logical
37. John Lewis Partnership Constitution - DigitalOcean, https://wikirate-production-storage.fra1.cdn.digitaloceanspaces.com/files/15212207/41141420.pdf
38. OUR FUTURE PARTNERSHIP, https://www.johnlewispartnership.co.uk/content/dam/cws/pdfs/Juniper/ARA2020/JLP-Business-Model-2020-ARA.pdf
39. John Lewis Partnership Constitution: Principles for a Happier, https://www.docsity.com/en/john-lewis-partnership-constitution/8999082/
40. Diss190221.pdf - ediss.sub.hamburg, https://ediss.sub.uni-hamburg.de/bitstream/ediss/8866/1/Diss190221.pdf
41. Die historische Entwicklung kommunaler Aufgaben - Uni Münster, http://www.uni-muenster.de/imperia/md/content/ifpol/mitarbeiter/heuer/historiekommunaleraufgaben.pdf
42. Genossenschaften in Vergangenheit, Gegenwart und Zukunft [1., https://dokumen.pub/genossenschaften-in-vergangenheit-gegenwart-und-zukunft-1nbsped-9783958322462.html
43. „Nachtwächterstaat“ oder „Praktisches Christenthum“?, https://tud.qucosa.de/api/qucosa%3A25299/attachment/ATT-0/
44. White Revolution in India: Amul, Kurien and NDDB - UPSC, https://digitallylearn.com/economy/white-revolution-origins-cooperative-genesis/
45. Dairying systems in India, https://www.fao.org/4/t3080t/t3080t07.htm
46. 'India's Milkman' Kurien quits Amul - The Economic Times, https://m.economictimes.com/indias-milkman-kurien-quits-amul/articleshow/1457434.cms
47. Dr. Verghese Kurian, father of India's White Revolution and founder, https://www.facebook.com/groups/1381359148755493/posts/4163862763838437/
48. India's milkman - Kurien and Amul - Maddy's Ramblings, https://maddy06.blogspot.com/2013/09/indias-milkman-kurien-and-amul.html
49. Amul: The Cooperative Success Story | PDF | Dairy | Milk - Scribd, https://www.scribd.com/document/96823363/Amul-Journal

50. Amul Company Project File | PDF - Scribd, https://www.scribd.com/document/865862496/Amul-company-project-file
51. The Chronicle of a Takeover Foretold: Why the Amul-Nandini, https://www.vibesofindia.com/the-chronicle-of-a-takeover-foretold-why-the-amul-nandini-controversy-is-important/
52. Working Paper 224 - bonndoc, https://bonndoc.ulb.uni-bonn.de/xmlui/bitstream/handle/20.500.11811/11100/PARI_WP_224_2023.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
53. Economic Crisis and Disillusionment from Socialism - Ran Abramitzky, https://ranabr.people.stanford.edu/sites/g/files/sbiybj26066/files/media/file/ablp_jeea.pdf
54. ALTERNATIVE REALITIES - German Historical Institute, https://www.ghi-dc.org/fileadmin/publications/Bulletin_Supplement/Supplement_14/Sup14.pdf
55. Self-Justification in the Artistic Practice and Artworks of Kibbutz, https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1095&context=communalsocieties
56. Can An Economic Crisis Shift Attitudes From Socialism to Capitalism, https://ranabr.people.stanford.edu/sites/g/files/sbiybj26066/files/media/file/economic-crisis-in-socialist-setting.pdf
57. One Hundred Years of Kibbutz Life: A Century of Crises and, https://dokumen.pub/one-hundred-years-of-kibbutz-life-a-century-of-crises-and-reinvention-9781412851954-1412851955.html
58. The Mystery of the Kibbutz: Egalitarian Principles in a Capitalist, https://dokumen.pub/the-mystery-of-the-kibbutz-egalitarian-principles-in-a-capitalist-world-9781400888153.html
59. 1 To Each According to Their Space-Need: Communes in Outer, https://ranabr.people.stanford.edu/sites/g/files/sbiybj26066/files/media/file/space-policy.pdf
60. the Rise and Fall of the Kibbutz - SFU Summit, https://summit.sfu.ca/_flysystem/fedora/2022-08/input_data/21995/etd21467.pdf
61. Der Hybrid - dokumen.pub, https://dokumen.pub/download/der-hybrid-das-19-jahrhundert-und-die-idee-der-genossenschaft-3515131817-9783515131810.html
62. Governance of the Mondragon Corporación Cooperativa, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/229591729_Governance_of_the_Mondragon_Corporacion_Cooperativa
63. (PDF) Dark Triad as Selection by the Very Wealthy: Elite-Aligned, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/401583397_Dark_Triad_as_Selection_by_the_Very_Wealthy_Elite-Aligned_Leadership_Emergence_Under_Person-Situation_Dynamics
64. Collective Dark Triad Leadership and the Ethics Mirage - MDPI, https://www.mdpi.com/2673-8104/5/4/21
65. Where Community Happens. The Kibbutz and the Philosophy of, https://library.oapen.org/bitstream/id/f8f76044-ff7d-4f0c-a086-d2d48f9b5ce0/6

50075.pdf