GL-07 Commons transition, cosmolocalism and the partner state

Theoretical Foundations: Peer Production, Cosmolocalism, and the Partner State

The transition toward commons-based economic arrangements rests on a fundamental reorientation of institutional economics: the proposition that human productive relations can be organized neither through bureaucratic state command nor through the price signals of private commodity markets, but through distributed networks of self-allocating contributors who pool resources to generate shared value[1]. The theoretical scaffolding of this model emerged from empirical analysis of digital network dynamics and expanded into physical manufacturing, municipal governance, and macroeconomic planning.

The Architecture of Commons-Based Peer Production

The conceptual foundation of Commons-Based Peer Production (CBPP) was formulated by legal scholar Yochai Benkler in *The Wealth of Networks* (2006)[3]. Benkler demonstrated that networked information technologies radically lower the marginal cost of communication, coordination, and information processing[5]. Under conditions where capital equipment for production—initially personal computers and software compilers—is broadly distributed across a population, the transaction costs that Ronald Coase identified as the rationale for corporate managerial hierarchies (1937, *The Nature of the Firm*) drop below the administrative overhead required to maintain bureaucratic firms. Consequently, decentralized social sharing and peer collaboration emerge as economically competitive and technologically superior modes of production[5].

Michel Bauwens, Vasilis Kostakis, and Alex Pazaitis systematized this dynamic into a macro-sociological framework in *Peer to Peer: The Commons Manifesto* (2019)[2]. They identified three core structural pillars within functional CBPP ecosystems[6]:

First, the *productive community* forms the generative base of the ecosystem. It consists of self-governing, open-membership collectives of contributors who assemble non-rival or pooled resources (software code, design blueprints, scientific knowledge) through modular, stigmergic coordination, wherein contributors act in response to digital traces left in the shared environment rather than bureaucratic commands[2].

Second, the *for-benefit association* provides defensive institutional infrastructure. Unlike corporate entities designed to maximize shareholder returns, these foundations and trusts (modeled on the Wikimedia Foundation, the Free Software Foundation, or the Linux Foundation) hold legal titles, protect the commons from private intellectual property enclosures, mobilize financial capital, and maintain core operational servers without directing the daily creative labor of the peer producers[1].

Third, the *generative enterprise ecosystem* connects the commons to physical material livelihoods. This layer comprises market-facing entities—predominantly worker cooperatives,

ethical micro-enterprises, and solidarity businesses—that extract market revenue by delivering custom implementations, physical installations, or localized maintenance on top of the shared digital commons. Crucially, generative enterprises are bound by institutional charters requiring them to reinvest surplus revenue, capital equipment, and newly developed intellectual property directly back into the productive community, preventing the asymmetric extraction of value characteristic of corporate platform monopolies[6].

The Cosmolocal Paradigm: Design Global, Manufacture Local

As digital fabrication technologies, computer numerical control (CNC) machining, and distributed electronics diffused during the early 2010s, theorists posited that CBPP could transcend immaterial software development. Vasilis Kostakis, Vasilis Niaros, George Dafermos, and Michel Bauwens formulated the model of cosmolocalism, known operationally as "Design Global, Manufacture Local" (DGML) (2015, *Futures*)[8].

Cosmolocalism establishes an institutional division between the informational and material layers of production. The informational layer—comprising design schematics, software, material formulations, and assembly protocols—is organized as a globally aggregated, non-rival digital commons accessible to all human settlements[11]. The physical layer—encompassing the transformation of raw matter, spatial assembly, physical tool manipulation, and end-use consumption—is organized within decentralized, bioregionally bounded workshops, micro-factories, and cooperative fabrication labs[11].

By circulating design code globally while producing physical artifacts close to the point of demand, cosmolocalism purports to eliminate the massive fossil expenditures, maritime shipping logistics, intellectual property rents, and planned obsolescence inherent to multinational corporate manufacturing[10]. The informational commons scales universally across planetary networks, while physical matter remains grounded within local ecological carry capacities and community assemblies[11].

The Ostrom-Inspired Partner State

A central structural vulnerability of localized commons regimes, historically documented by Elinor Ostrom in *Governing the Commons* (1990), is their vulnerability to external resource expropriation, regulatory suppression, or aggressive market enclosure in the absence of protective, higher-order institutional recognition[5]. To resolve the relationship between localized self-governance and centralized territorial authority, Italian political economist Cosma Orsi (2005, 2009) proposed the concept of the "partner state," subsequently adapted by Bauwens and Kostakis (2014) into commons transition theory[4].

The partner state re-engineers public institutions. Instead of serving as a neoliberal market guarantor—an authority that privatizes public assets, deregulates speculative finance, and uses legal force to uphold monopoly intellectual property rights—or an authoritarian command-and-control state planner, the partner state functions as an empowering, public-interest platform[15]. Its primary mandate is to protect, resource, and scale civic commoning[16].

Operationally, the partner state executes this mandate through several mechanisms. It establishes public-commons partnerships that transfer decommissioned public land,

abandoned civic buildings, and ecological preserves directly to commoners under permanent usufruct agreements[7]. It codifies institutional bodies such as "Chambers of the Commons" and "Commoners' Assemblies" to grant direct legislative and budgetary standing to informal stewarding communities[7].

Furthermore, the partner state experiments with novel licensing regimes, such as CopyFair or Commons-Reciprocity Licenses, which permit non-commercial commons usage without fee, while legally requiring commercial, for-profit entities to pay royalties or contribute back to the common pool[5]. Finally, it de-risks civic labor participation by funding universal basic services or basic incomes, shielding citizens from market coercion and freeing labor time for uncommodified peer production[17].

The Trophic Ladder of Knowledge Versus Matter

The theoretical cohesion of cosmolocalism relies on what can be conceptualized as the trophic ladder of knowledge versus matter. In natural trophic ecosystems, thermodynamic energy decays exponentially as it moves upward through biological strata: plants convert a tiny fraction of incoming solar radiation into biomass, herbivores assimilate roughly ten percent of that plant matter, and apex predators capture only ten percent of the herbivore energy. In a post-capitalist productive paradigm, the governance and structural properties of economic activity invert across the boundary between bits and atoms.

Analytical Dimension	The Knowledge Layer (Bits / Information)	The Material Layer (Atoms / Physical Matter)
Thermodynamic Property	Non-rival; marginal cost of reproduction approaches zero; non-depletable through consumption[13].	Rival; governed by physical conservation laws and thermodynamic entropy; subject to mechanical wear, friction, and decay[13].
Optimal Scale of Coordination	Planetary; universal communication protocols benefit from maximum network effects and globally pooled intelligence[12].	Local to Bioregional; strictly bounded by geographical distance, watershed yields, and localized material metabolisms[11].
Primary Failure Mode	Artificial enclosure through state-enforced intellectual property monopolies, digital rights management, and platform cartels[17].	Depletion through unregulated open access (the tragedy of open access) and metabolic rift through over-extraction[13].

Governance Architecture	Heterarchical stigmergy; voluntary peer contribution; transparent version-control forks; non-exclusionary commons licensing[1].	Ostrom-style Common Pool Resource (CPR) institutions; strict boundary demarcation; physical monitoring; graduated sanctions[1].
Underlying Physical Baseline	Exceptionally high hidden industrial complexity (semiconductor fabs, lithography lasers, subsea cables, cleanrooms).	Variable; capable of functioning on low-entropy artisanal energy or advanced distributed fabrication tools[22].

This asymmetry exposes the central vulnerability of cosmolocalism: the knowledge layer requires a planet-spanning, energy-dense physical infrastructure to maintain its non-rival ubiquity[1]. If the physical base degrades, the trophic ladder collapses from the top down.

Empirical Case Studies and Structural Dissections

The FLOK Society Project (Ecuador, 2013–2014)

In 2013, the Ecuadorian government under President Rafael Correa, through the Coordinating Ministry of Knowledge and Human Talent (headed by Guillaume Long) and the Secretariat of Higher Education, Science, Technology and Innovation (SENESCYT, headed by René Ramírez), commissioned Michel Bauwens to direct the Free/Libre Open Knowledge (FLOK) Society Project (*Buen Conocer*)[17]. The project represented the world's first state-sponsored initiative to formulate a national macroeconomic transition strategy based entirely on digital commons and peer-to-peer dynamics[17].

Operating with a public grant of approximately $700,000, Bauwens assembled an international research team, including social theorists Daniel Vázquez and Xabier Barandiaran[24]. Over fifteen months, the research team conducted systematic policy consultations across indigenous federations, agricultural syndicates, universities, and civil service ministries[24].

The project culminated in the *Buen Conocer Summit* in Quito in May 2014 and the publication of a ten-volume policy framework[24]. The documents detailed concrete legislative and institutional transformations:

- Mandating that all state-funded educational, medical, and scientific research be licensed under open-access public licenses[25].
- Establishing an open-source seed commons to protect traditional agroecological germplasm from agrochemical patent cartels[25].
- Re-orienting public procurement away from proprietary technology vendors toward domestic, worker-owned open-hardware and free-software cooperatives[25].
- Establishing regional "Centres of Buen Conocer" to incubate distributed fabrication tools adapted to rural agricultural challenges[25].

The institutional outcome of the FLOK Society project was a complete breakdown[7]. Between late 2014 and 2015, global commodity markets experienced a precipitous drop in crude oil prices, which severely constrained Ecuador's state treasury. Confronted with immediate fiscal distress, the Correa administration abandoned the open-knowledge transition documents and dismantled the coordinating policy units[27]. The state reasserted an extractive developmentalist strategy, approving expansive petroleum extraction leases in the pristine Yasuní National Park (specifically the ITT blocks) and negotiating major mining and infrastructure concessions with Chinese state enterprises[27].

The partner state did not materialize. Under conditions of macroeconomic volatility, the central state retreated to its structural baseline: commodifying finite ecological reserves to generate foreign exchange reserves and service sovereign debt, demonstrating that theoretical commons frameworks lack institutional defense mechanisms against macroeconomic shocks[27].

The Ghent Commons Transition Plan (Belgium, 2017)

In 2016, the municipal government of Ghent, Belgium, led by Mayor Daniël Termont and Deputy Mayor Astrid De Bruycker, engaged Michel Bauwens and Yurek Onzia to map the city's civic initiatives and author a comprehensive transition roadmap[13]. Published in June 2017 as the *Commons Transition Plan for the City of Ghent*, the report documented an expansion of the city's civic fabric, growing from roughly fifty initiatives in 2007 to over 500 active commons-oriented projects across food distribution, renewable energy generation, co-housing, and neighborhood repair spaces in 2017[13].

The plan outlined forty-six specific institutional recommendations designed to formalize relations between commoners and municipal bureaucracies[20]. Key proposals included the establishment of a "City of Ghent Commons Accord" to standardize administrative agreements between loose civic collectives and city departments, the creation of a "Chamber of the Commons" to aggregate political advocacy for commoners, and the establishment of a municipal incubator for "Open Cooperatives" to provide seed capital and legal templates for civic enterprises[7].

To operationalize these concepts, the municipal administration relied on its "Temporary Use Fund" (*Tijdelijk Gebruik*), capitalized at €300,000 annually, which disbursed grants and short-term permits to twenty-five experimental urban projects occupying vacant municipal plots and buildings[19]. Exemplary sites included *De Site*—a former Alcatel Bell manufacturing complex in the high-density Rabot district transformed into community gardens, community kitchens, and athletic spaces—and *NEST*, an eight-story temporary civic space housed in the decommissioned municipal library[19].

Despite broad civic participation and positive municipal branding, empirical post-occupancy evaluations revealed an acute structural failure mode[19]. The city administration relied on temporary occupancy contracts (typically spanning one to three years) rather than transferring permanent, non-alienable land titles or establishing perpetual community usufruct[19]. When the temporary lease for *NEST* expired, the city council reclaimed the valuable real estate asset, displacing the civic collectives and returning the building to high-value commercial and

administrative development[19].
Urban sociological evaluations indicate that Ghent functionally utilized commoners as uncompensated neighborhood stabilizers: civic collectives absorbed the social costs of urban blight, revitalized decaying neighborhoods, and elevated local land values, after which the municipal apparatus reclaimed the appreciated real estate for conventional market circulation[19]. The commons transition plan functioned as an instrument of civic-subsidized gentrification rather than a durable transfer of urban property rights.

The Bologna Regulation and the Co-Cities Protocol (Italy, 2014–Present)

The institutional template for municipal public-commons partnerships was formulated in 2014 through the *Bologna Regulation on Collaboration for the Care and Regeneration of the Urban Commons* (*Regolamento sui beni comuni*), authored by legal scholars Christian Iaione and Sheila Foster in close collaboration with the administrative association Labsus (*Laboratorio per la Sussidiarietà*)[30].
The legal mechanism of the Bologna Regulation was the "Pact of Collaboration" (*Patto di Collaborazione*), a contractual instrument enabling municipal administrations to enter into legally binding operational agreements directly with informal citizen groups, organized neighborhoods, or civil associations[31]. These pacts circumvented standard competitive public procurement procedures, empowering citizens to propose projects to co-manage, maintain, or adaptively reuse municipal public squares, urban parks, historical arcades, and abandoned public buildings[18].
Iaione and Foster systematically assessed the performance of this framework via the "Co-Cities Project," tracking 280 pacts executed in Bologna between 2014 and 2016 and documenting the replication of the regulatory code across more than 180 Italian municipalities (including Turin, Reggio Emilia, Naples, and Rome) and international pilot programs[30]. The Co-Cities framework formalizes a five-actor "quintuple helix" governance protocol: active civic commoners, public administrative authorities, private industrial or business actors, knowledge institutions (universities, research centers), and civil society organizations[18].
Empirical evaluation reveals a distinct administrative and economic ceiling. Quantitative audits of pacts executed across Italian cities indicate that over 70% of signed agreements were classified as "ordinary" micro-interventions: planting floral beds, adopting tree pits, repainting municipal school classrooms, or cleaning graffiti off historic walls[18]. Fewer than 8% achieved the status of "complex" pacts involving the autonomous civic management of high-value structural real estate or the creation of self-sustaining economic enterprises[18].
Political scientists noted that the Bologna model functioned primarily as an administrative valve for severe municipal budget austerity imposed by national deficit pacts[18]. Municipalities systematically utilized the rhetoric of civic co-governance to replace unionized municipal maintenance labor with uncompensated citizen volunteer hours, while public authorities retained unilateral power to revoke, modify, or terminate pacts at will[18].

The Amsterdam City Doughnut and Circular Strategy (2020–2025)

In April 2020, during the initial wave of COVID-19 disruptions, the Executive Board of the City of

Amsterdam formally adopted Kate Raworth's "Doughnut Economics" framework as the foundational planning architecture for its *Amsterdam Circular Strategy 2020–2025*[37]. Developed collaboratively between the municipal government, Raworth's Doughnut Economics Action Lab (DEAL), and the research consultancy Circle Economy, the framework scaled down planetary environmental thresholds to an urban policy tool called the "City Portrait"[37].

The Amsterdam City Portrait operationalized a matrix combining four distinct analytical lenses: the local social foundation (assessing living standards, health, education, and shelter within Amsterdam), the local ecological ceiling (assessing city air quality, water health, and green spaces), the global social impact (evaluating human rights and labor conditions embedded within the supply chains feeding Amsterdam), and the global ecological boundary (measuring Amsterdam's metabolic contribution to worldwide carbon emissions, plastic dispersion, and biodiversity depletion)[37].

Amsterdam established explicit metabolic benchmarks: a 50% reduction in the city's total consumption of primary virgin raw materials by 2030, a fully circular urban metabolism by 2050, and mandatory circular procurement requirements on all public infrastructural development from 2023 onward[37]. The primary spatial testbed was the *Haven-Stad* urban development initiative, a planned transformation of industrial harbor zones into a dense residential district comprising between 40,000 and 70,000 homes built entirely with zero-emission logistics, modular timber frameworks, and recycled concrete aggregates[21].

The empirical trajectory of the Amsterdam model revealed an unresolved structural contradiction between ecological boundary planning and capital-intensive urban needs[21]. By 2022, academic critiques and municipal audits noted that the circular construction guidelines increased baseline residential development costs by 15% to 30%, colliding with an urban housing crisis characterized by a structural shortfall of more than 40,000 affordable homes[21]. Concurrently, national legal rulings on the Dutch "nitrogen crisis" (*stikstofcrisis*) brought spatial development across the region to an administrative halt, demonstrating that municipal circular ambitions remain subordinate to regional regulatory and ecological thresholds[21]. While the Doughnut provided diagnostic clarity regarding urban metabolic rifts, the municipality lacked legal and financial instruments to challenge speculative private land ownership, suppress rising rents, or compel international construction syndicates to accept reduced profit margins[21].

Open Source Ecology and the Global Village Construction Set (2003–Present)

In 2003, Marcin Jakubowski, an American physicist trained at Princeton University and the University of Wisconsin-Madison, founded Open Source Ecology (OSE) to operationalize open-hardware engineering for agrarian community autonomy[40]. Operating out of *Factor e Farm*, a 30-acre off-grid research farm in rural Maysville, Missouri, Jakubowski launched the Global Village Construction Set (GVCS)[22].

The GVCS was conceived as an open-source industrial platform: a modular set of fifty foundational machines theoretically sufficient for an intentional settlement of 4 to 200 people to manufacture and sustain modern infrastructure from localized materials and industrial scrap[22]. The machine taxonomy covered eight essential domains:

- *Habitat*: Compressed Earth Block (CEB) Press, Cement Mixer, Dimensional Sawmill[43].
- *Agriculture*: LifeTrac Tractor, Soil Pulverizer, Spader, Hay Rake, Well-Drilling Rig[10].
- *Industry*: Plasma Cutter, CNC Torch Table, Ironworker, Induction Furnace, Sheet Metal Roller[43].
- *Energy*: Hydraulic Power Cube, Biomass Gasifier, Steam Engine, Solar Concentrator[43].
- *Materials*: Plastic Extruder, Scrap Metal Granulator, Bioplastic Pyrolysis Unit[43].
- *Transportation*: Open-Source Micro-Truck, Heavy Loader, Earth Mover[43].
- *Electronics*: Open-Source Circuit Mill, 3D Printer (D3D), Laser Cutter[43].
- *Hydraulics*: Universal Hydraulic Motor, Valve Spool Stack, High-Pressure Pumping Unit.

Jakubowski gained widespread support following a viral 2011 TED talk, raising $63,500 via Kickstarter and receiving a multi-year fellowship from the Shuttleworth Foundation in 2012[22]. OSE asserted that its modular, open-source designs could be fabricated on-site for approximately 10% to 20% of commercial equipment costs (for instance, fabricating an industrial CEB press for $5,000 compared to purchasing a proprietary Caterpillar or Vermeer unit for $40,000)[22].

Empirical assessments after twenty years of continuous operation reveal an unbridgeable engineering and institutional gap:

First, completion metrics lagged behind project milestones. By 2018, only twelve of the fifty machines had achieved working, physical prototypes, with fewer than five (the CEB Press, the LifeTrac tractor, the modular PowerCube, and the 3D Printer) receiving complete, peer-reviewed engineering documentation and fabrication manuals accessible for public replication[43].

Second, independent replication of the machines remained rare[47]. Engineering teams outside of *Factor e Farm* struggled to replicate the designs because of unstandardized fabrication steps, missing tolerance specifications, and the absence of quality-control protocols[47].

Third, the operational site suffered from volunteer turnover[47]. Qualitative studies of *Factor e Farm* documented an annual volunteer and fellow turnover rate exceeding 90%[47]. The organizational dynamic centered on the charismatic authority of Jakubowski, which generated severe labor burnout, high conflict over operational priorities, and a persistent inability to transition from a founder-dominated family compound to a distributed peer-governed engineering network[48].

Fourth, the platform remained dependent on global industrial supply chains[22]. The machines did not self-replicate from localized dirt and scrap metal. Their construction required precision components sourced from multinational suppliers: double-acting hydraulic cylinders, hardened chrome-plated piston shafts, precision-ground taper bearings, high-pressure hydraulic pumps, internal combustion engines (Kohler or Briggs & Stratton), and complex micro-controllers[22]. The GVCS was not a post-industrial production system, but an open-source assembly protocol that depended entirely on high-entropy global industrial manufacturing[22].

The Fab City Initiative (2014–Present)

The Fab City network was established at the Fab10 conference in Barcelona in 2014 by Venezuelan architect Tomas Diez, Neil Gershenfeld (Director of the MIT Center for Bits and

Atoms), and Vicente Guallart (then Chief Architect of Barcelona)[8]. The initiative established a municipal commitment: signatory cities must pledge to achieve at least 50% material self-sufficiency by the year 2054[8]. Over forty cities and bioregions—including Barcelona, Paris, Amsterdam, Boston, Santiago de Chile, and Hamburg—formally signed the pledge[8].

The operational premise of the Fab City paradigm is the structural shift from a "Product-In, Trash-Out" (PITO) urban metabolism to a "Data-In, Data-Out" (DIDO) urban metabolism[8]. Under the PITO regime, cities import manufactured physical goods and export solid waste and atmospheric emissions[8]. Under the DIDO regime, only informational data, open-source blueprints, and software protocols cross municipal boundaries, while all physical commodities, energy, food, and materials are produced, recycled, and circulated locally through a municipal network of Fab Labs and micro-factories[8].

Empirical evaluations across the network indicate a stark divergence between municipal branding and metabolic reality[8]. A decennial evaluation of the flagship Barcelona initiative indicates that distributed digital fabrication accounts for less than 0.01% of the total physical material flows of the city[8].

Fab Labs operate primarily as rapid-prototyping environments for design students, high-tech hobbyists, and corporate workshops, rather than functional centers for urban manufacturing[8]. Furthermore, the equipment inside these labs—desktop 3D printers, CO2 laser cutters, multi-axis CNC mills, and surface-mount electronics stations—is tied to high-tech global supply chains[8]. Laser optics are imported from China, precision stepper motors from Japan, integrated micro-controllers from Taiwan, and 3D printing filaments from multinational chemical syndicates[8]. The model consumes high-grade industrial parts to manufacture low-tolerance plastic and plywood consumer goods, leaving the metabolic extraction patterns of the host cities unchanged.

Triadic Patterns and Institutional Mechanisms: The Commonsverse

To address the limitations of isolated municipal and open-source experiments, David Bollier and Silke Helfrich developed a patterns-based approach to the commons in *Free, Fair and Alive: The Insurgent Power of the Commons* (2019)[5]. Drawing on the architectural design language of Christopher Alexander, Bollier and Helfrich argued that the commons cannot be understood through standard economic paradigms of property and resource allocation[52]. Rather than viewing the commons as a physical resource, they conceptualized it as an active social process: *commoning*[7].

Bollier and Helfrich structured their governance architecture around the "Triad of Commoning," consisting of three mutually dependent spheres: Peer Governance, Practicing Provisioning, and the Inner Life of Commoning[52].

Peer Governance replaces traditional corporate hierarchy and state bureaucracy with decentralized, consent-based operational patterns[52]. Within this sphere, groups bring diversity into shared purpose by assembling contributors with different technical skills without imposing ideological uniformity. They assure transparency within a sphere of trust by keeping operational

accounts, resource inventories, and contribution logs publicly viewable, mitigating the emergence of hidden informational monopolies[53].

Decision-making is shared lexically: authority is distributed across autonomous, overlapping circles where decisions are executed by those directly affected using sociocratic consent protocols rather than majoritarian voting. The governance architecture relies on distributed heterarchy, rotating administrative roles based on situational competence rather than permanent status. Conflicts are processed through graduated sanctions, adapting Ostrom's core design principle into proactive, restorative mediation before punitive exclusion is applied[13].

Practicing Provisioning replaces the capitalist logic of "production for sale at market prices" with collaborative provisioning aimed directly at use-value and community survival[52]. Producers and consumers converge through pooling, making and using resources together to eliminate market transaction costs[13].

Communities employ convivial tools (in the framework of Ivan Illich)—technologies that are simple to repair, understand, and modify without reliance on proprietary cartels[23]. Harvested surpluses are distributed based on biological need and participatory contribution, rather than purchasing power. Basic survival necessities—drinking water, shelter, baseline agricultural seeds—are systematically decommodified, insulating the resource pool from speculative financial markets and internalizing ecological costs directly into group accounting[5].

The Inner Life of Commoning addresses the psychological and cultural conditions necessary to sustain collective stewardship[52]. It rejects the self-interested axioms of neoclassical economics, cultivating shared purpose and trust through prolonged, face-to-face interdependence.

It grounds governance in relational ontologies, acknowledging that individual well-being cannot be disentangled from the health of the community and the surrounding watershed. These social obligations are reinforced through communal rituals, shared meals, and regular seasonal gatherings, anchoring formal institutional rules within lived social cohesion.

Ostrom Design Principle (1990)	**Bollier-Helfrich Commoning Pattern (2019)**	**Institutional Difference**
DP1: Clearly Defined Boundaries Individuals with rights to withdraw resource units must be clearly defined, as must the boundaries of the CPR itself[13].	**Open Systems Through Permeable Membranes** Boundaries are relational, adaptive, and semi-permeable; commons welcome contributors while excluding predatory capital extraction.	Rejects fixed spatial and property enclosure; establishes functional protocols for contribution tracking while maintaining defensive barriers against capital extraction.
DP2: Congruence	**Match Needs to**	Extends beyond optimal

Between Appropriation and Local Conditions Rules governing appropriation must match local ecological conditions and labor/material demands[13].	**Ecosystem Yields** Provisioning systems must be directly calibrated to localized, regenerative ecological carrying capacities without commodification.	extraction yields toward ecological regeneration and degrowth material metabolisms.
DP3: Collective-Choice Arrangements Most individuals affected by operational rules can participate in modifying those rules[13].	**Peer Governance through Heterarchy and Consent** Decisions are made by affected parties through nested circles, sociocratic consent, and non-majoritarian dispute resolution.	Shifts from formal majoritarian voting—which risks majoritarian capture—to consent-based, polycentric decision architectures.
DP4: Monitoring Monitors who audit CPR conditions and appropriator behavior are accountable to the appropriators or are the appropriators themselves[13].	**Assure Transparency in a Sphere of Trust** Information regarding resource flows, labor inputs, and asset stores is openly accessible to all commoners via open-book ledgers[53].	Shifts enforcement from specialized municipal watchmen or policing to transparent, peer-to-peer data visibility.
DP5: Graduated Sanctions Sanctions for rule violations start low and scale up depending on the seriousness and context of the offense[13].	**Auto-Regulate Conflict and Transformative Justice** Violations are treated as relational ruptures requiring mediation, restitution, and community integration before punitive actions.	Replaces legalistic financial penalties with restorative protocols designed to repair the community social fabric.
DP6: Conflict-Resolution Mechanisms	**Address Latent Conflicts via Continuous Mediation**	Views interpersonal conflict not as an exceptional procedural failure, but as an

Rapid access to low-cost, local arenas to resolve conflicts between appropriators or between appropriators and officials[13].	Frictions are surfaced proactively through designed cultural spaces, rituals, and peer feedback circles.	ongoing social dynamic to be managed.
DP7: Minimal Recognition of Rights to Organize The rights of appropriators to devise their own institutions are not challenged by external governmental authorities[13].	**Insurgent Autonomy and Partner-State Alliances** Commoners assert operational legitimacy independently while establishing public-commons partnerships to secure state resources[16].	Moves beyond defensive claims for state tolerance toward aggressive institutional strategies that subordinate state mechanisms to the commons[16].
DP8: Nested Enterprises For CPRs that are parts of larger systems, appropriation, provision, monitoring, and governance are organized in multiple layers[13].	**Cosmolocal Federation and Scale-Wide Federation** Local commons federate regionally and globally via open protocols, forming parallel transnational provisioning layers[7].	Transcends nested territorial administrative units to construct a global knowledge commons connected to distributed bioregional production nodes[12].

The Scale Ledgers

Assessing the real-world performance of commons architectures requires tracking them across the eight rungs of human social organization:

- **R1: Household** (4 to 10 people)
- **R2: Hamlet / Band** (30 to 50 people)
- **R3: Village** (150 to 500 people)
- **R4: Parish / District** (1,500 to 5,000 people)
- **R5: Town / Watershed** (15,000 to 50,000 people)
- **R6: Region / Bioregion** (0.5 to 5 million people)
- **R7: Nation / Continent** (50 to 500 million people)
- **R8: Planet** (8 billion people)

Scale Ledger 1: Bauwens and Kostakis' Cosmolocalism & Peer Production (DGML)

Rung	Status	Operational Mechanics, Limits, and Root Cause of Failure
R1: Household	Worked	Domestic fabrication functions for personal utility; households download open blueprints to 3D print domestic utensils, repair brackets, or program open-source micro-controllers. Constrained by tool acquisition costs.
R2: Hamlet / Band	Worked	Tool libraries and communal fabrication sheds pool capital equipment; open designs for localized solar dehydrators and small agricultural implements are maintained through high personal trust.
R3: Village	Worked	Rural manufacturing hubs (e.g., Tzoumakers in the Tzoumerka mountains of Greece) fabricate customized small-scale farming tools using open designs[5]. Social cohesion prevents privatization.
R4: Parish / District	Degraded	Micro-enterprises struggle to cover operating overhead; reliance on volunteer design labor introduces production delays and unstandardized inventories.

R5: Town / Watershed	Failed	Local micro-factories cannot compete economically with global mass production. Sourcing specialized alloys, precision bearings, and microchips requires corporate industrial supply chains.
R6: Bioregion	Never Tried	Requires complete regional supply-chain integration across metallurgy, polymer chemistry, and micro-electronics, exceeding the coordination capacity of voluntary networks.
R7: Nation / Continent	Failed	Attempted through national policy design in Ecuador (FLOK Society)[17]. Sunk by macroeconomic dependence on oil revenues and central state prioritization of commodity export markets[27].
R8: Planet	Worked (Digital Only)	Highly effective for digital code and technical documentation (Linux kernel, Wikipedia, GitHub repositories)[3]. Physical production remains fragmented and reliant on multinational shipping.

Scale Ledger 2: P2P Foundation Commons Transition Plans (Ghent 2017 Model)

Rung	Status	Operational Mechanics, Limits, and Root Cause of

		Failure
R1: Household	Untried	The model does not address the domestic division of reproductive labor, focusing on public civic associations and municipal bureaucracies[13].
R2: Hamlet / Band	Worked	Effective in urban co-housing projects, communal urban gardens, and neighborhood tool-sharing spaces supported by municipal seed grants[19].
R3: Village	Worked	Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) farms linked directly to urban consumer collectives (e.g., *Voedselteams* around Ghent) operate with stable participation and predictable yields.
R4: Parish / District	Worked	District-scale commons hubs (*De Site* in Rabot) operate community kitchens, sports sites, and garden allocations under municipal facilitation[19].
R5: Town / Watershed	Degraded	City-wide experiments (*NEST*) were co-opted; municipal authorities used temporary commons to stabilize dilapidated neighborhoods, later reclaiming the real estate for commercial

		redevelopment[19].
R6: Bioregion	Never Tried	Administrative and jurisdictional boundaries between the City of Ghent and neighboring Flemish agricultural districts prevented integrated bioregional planning.
R7: Nation / Continent	Never Tried	Belgian constitutional and private property law prevented the state-sanctioned transfer of public assets into permanent, non-alienable commons trusts.
R8: Planet	Never Tried	International scaling remained confined to theoretical discourse and inter-municipal academic symposiums without structural implementation.

Scale Ledger 3: Foster and Iaione's Bologna Regulation & Co-Cities Protocol

Rung	Status	Operational Mechanics, Limits, and Root Cause of Failure
R1: Household	Untried	The legal regulation applies specifically to public municipal assets and civic infrastructure in urban spaces[31].
R2: Hamlet / Band	Worked	Micro-neighborhood groups sign collaboration

		pacts to rehabilitate historical porticoes, maintain pocket parks, or run street-corner book exchanges[18].
R3: Village	Worked	Small rural Italian municipalities use collaboration pacts to co-manage public libraries, community halls, and rural paths with high civic oversight[32].
R4: Parish / District	Worked	Neighborhood pacts handle the adaptive reuse of major urban assets (e.g., the Saint Jozef Church in Ghent, complex civic centers in Bologna)[19].
R5: Town / Watershed	Degraded	Over 70% of pacts remain restricted to low-level maintenance (gardening, cleaning)[18]. Municipal authorities use pacts to offset public service austerity by offloading work onto volunteers[18].
R6: Bioregion	Never Tried	Fragmented municipal jurisdictions and competing provincial authorities prevent the scaling of pacts across regional river catchments.
R7: Nation / Continent	Failed	Italian national audit bodies and administrative courts challenged pacts of collaboration for bypassing statutory competitive

		tendering and procurement mandates[18].
R8: Planet	Never Tried	The protocol requires a functional municipal administrative apparatus with recognized legal jurisdiction, making it inapplicable at the global level.

Scale Ledger 4: Raworth's Doughnut Economics & Amsterdam Implementation

Rung	Status	Operational Mechanics, Limits, and Root Cause of Failure
R1: Household	Worked	Serves as an educational diagnostic for households assessing personal carbon expenditures, water usage, and nutritional footprints.
R2: Hamlet / Band	Worked	Applied in intentional eco-villages and housing cooperatives to establish voluntary ecological consumption ceilings and shared waste cycles.
R3: Village	Worked	Small rural settlements (such as pilot villages in Cornwall and Gelderland) utilized the framework to audit municipal composting and localized renewable energy production.
R4: Parish / District	Worked	Used in urban

		neighborhoods to map localized social deficits (fuel poverty, substandard insulation) against municipal environmental parameters.
R5: Town / Watershed	Degraded	Municipal deployment in Amsterdam clashed with urban growth pressures[21]. Mandating circular construction materials increased building costs by 15–30%, stalling social housing delivery[21].
R6: Bioregion	Failed	Bioregional ecological pressures (such as the Dutch agricultural nitrogen crisis) crossed municipal boundaries, rendering city-scale policies ineffective[21].
R7: Nation / Continent	Never Tried	No national government has replaced Gross Domestic Product (GDP) growth metrics with binding Doughnut boundary ceilings.
R8: Planet	Worked (Diagnostic)	Functioned as a foundational global analytical model (Stockholm Resilience Centre planetary boundaries)[37]. Failed as a binding governance tool; planetary boundary breaches accelerated.

Scale Ledger 5: Open Source Ecology (Global Village Construction

Set)

Rung	Status	Operational Mechanics, Limits, and Root Cause of Failure
R1: Household	Degraded	Fabricating desktop machines (e.g., 3D printers) is feasible, but building heavy industrial machinery (tractors, earth-movers) exceeds household space and tooling capacities[44].
R2: Hamlet / Band	Worked	The core crew at *Factor e Farm* used the Compressed Earth Block Press to construct on-site workshops and cleared agricultural fields with the prototype LifeTrac[22].
R3: Village	Failed	Village-scale deployments collapsed due to mechanical breakdowns, hydraulic leaks, lack of standardized replacement parts, and excessive maintenance hours[47].
R4: Parish / District	Never Tried	Sourcing precision replacement components required an integrated network of machine shops that OSE could not establish or sustain.
R5: Town / Watershed	Never Tried	Machines could not secure commercial occupational safety certifications or provide warranties,

		precluding municipal adoption.
R6: Bioregion	Never Tried	Industrial scaling stalled due to complete dependency on external, non-local suppliers for hydraulics, electronics, and precision-ground steel[22].
R7: Nation / Continent	Never Tried	The project never reached the manufacturing volume or regulatory compliance required to influence regional or national industrial policy.
R8: Planet	Worked (Digital Only)	CAD schematics, instructional videos, and documentation were downloaded globally by hundreds of thousands of users[22]. Physical construction remained isolated to hobbyists.

Scale Ledger 6: The Fab City Network

Rung	Status	Operational Mechanics, Limits, and Root Cause of Failure
R1: Household	Worked	Individuals print basic household plastic items, brackets, and prototypes using personal desktop 3D printers from open design repositories.
R2: Hamlet / Band	Worked	Makerspaces and Fab Labs function as community

		spaces for tinkering, small-scale artistic production, and technical education[8].
R3: Village	Worked	Demonstrated in specialized rural living laboratories (such as the Green Fab Lab Valldaura in Catalonia) harvesting local timber using CNC equipment.
R4: Parish / District	Worked	Neighborhood Fab Labs (e.g., Fab Lab Poblenou) provide educational training and assist local micro-enterprises with rapid prototyping[8].
R5: Town / Watershed	Failed	The target of 50% material self-sufficiency by 2054 remains unmet; Fab Labs account for less than 0.01% of physical consumer goods in signatory cities[8].
R6: Bioregion	Never Tried	Distributed digital workshops cannot replace heavy industrial production (structural steel smelting, bulk food processing, chemical refining).
R7: Nation / Continent	Never Tried	Absent from national industrial planning, trade policy negotiations, and defense industrial capacity.
R8: Planet	Worked (Network Only)	Successful transnational network for sharing design

		files, holding academic conferences, and standardizing educational curricula across forty cities[8].

The Capture Tests: Dark-Triad Vulnerabilities and Oligarchic Drift

A critical vulnerability in commons literature is the implicit assumption of universal pro-social benevolence. In historical reality and post-collapse environments, open-access, self-organizing groups serve as ideal operating grounds for individuals exhibiting dark-triad personality traits: narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. Without formal, legally binding constitutional constraints, open horizontal systems are vulnerable to takeovers.

The Mechanics of Exploitation in Horizontal Systems

Narcissism: Charismatic Dominance and Symbolic Weaponization

In groups lacking formal, codified executive hierarchies, organizational authority defaults to charismatic dominance, as articulated in Max Weber's political sociology[49]. Narcissistic individuals exploit this dynamic by weaponizing the moral rhetoric of the commons to establish personal status.

They position themselves as the living embodiment of the project's ethical mission, using their visibility to monopolize public discourse and external media relationships. Within the collective, they demand uncompensated labor from participants, framing mundane maintenance work as revolutionary dedication while dismissing administrative criticism or financial audits as ideological treason or personal persecution[49].

Machiavellianism: Informal Cartels and the Tyranny of Structurelessness

In 1972, political theorist Jo Freeman published *The Tyranny of Structurelessness*, demonstrating that an un-structured, horizontal collective does not eliminate power; it merely conceals it. Machiavellian actors exploit this dynamic. Because there are no formal elections, transparent job descriptions, or codified terms of office, operational power concentrates within an informal inner circle: an unmonitored clique operating behind the scenes.

By managing interpersonal communication, filtering resource flows, and controlling information, these actors exercise unchecked authority while deflecting institutional accountability. Aaron Shaw and Benjamin Mako Hill provided quantitative proof of this vulnerability in their 2014 study of 683 online peer-production wikis (*Laboratories of Oligarchy*), confirming that as open projects scale, they centralize administrative control within an entrenched, self-perpetuating elite, validating Robert Michels' 1911 "Iron Law of Oligarchy"[54].

Psychopathy: Parasitic Extraction and Strategic Defection

In game-theoretic terms, an open commons functions as an un-monitored pool of collective value (labor, material capital, tools, social trust). A predatory individual with low empathy and high callousness can execute a strategy of systematic defection: extracting maximum utility from the pooled asset while contributing minimal labor to its maintenance. In open-hardware

workshops, agricultural collectives, and community spaces, this manifests as monopolizing expensive tooling for personal profit-driven businesses, consuming shared raw materials without reimbursement, and abandoning the group once the equipment breaks down or operational costs accrue.

Governance Framework	Dark-Triad Attack Vector	Historical / Documented Manifestation	Structural Mechanisms for Resistance and Reversal
Cosmolocalism & Peer Production (Bauwens & Kostakis) [cite: 5]	**Netarchical Value Extraction**: A Machiavellian faction or corporate partner funds the physical fabrication site, extracts open designs, integrates them into proprietary commercial hardware, and secures patents on minor modifications, returning no capital to the commons[5].	The commercial capture of the open-source RepRap 3D printer project: commercial spin-offs (e.g., MakerBot) utilized open community designs to build proprietary printers, patented critical components, and closed off their schematics, leaving the volunteer open-hardware community uncompensated[3].	**CopyFair / Commons-Reciprocity Licensing**: Conditioning commercial usage of designs on mandatory financial or intellectual contributions to the commons pool[5]. Establishing legal defense trusts with binding anti-enclosure clauses.
Ghent Commons Transition Plan [cite: 13]	**Civic-Subsidized Gentrification**: Municipal planners and private developers deploy civic commoners into run-down neighborhoods under "temporary use" leases. Commoners invest uncompensated labor to stabilize	The decommissioning of the *NEST* commons center in the former Ghent municipal library: once the building was rehabilitated by civic groups, the municipality ended the temporary license and returned the	**Perpetual Community Land Trusts (CLTs)**: Requiring that real estate titles be transferred into community-governed land trusts with permanent anti-speculation covenants before civic rehabilitation

	the district, after which developers evict them and build luxury housing[19].	property to conventional real estate development[19].	begins.
Bologna Regulation & Co-Cities [cite: 30, 34]	**Labor Exploitation & Clientelism**: Local political figures use "Pacts of Collaboration" to dismantle unionized municipal public works, deploying vulnerable, low-income citizens as unpaid municipal maintenance labor while directing complex contracts to political supporters[18].	Empirical audits across southern Italian municipalities where collaboration pacts were granted to non-profits managed by relatives of municipal councilors, while basic sanitation work in poorer districts was shifted to unpaid volunteers[18].	**Dual-Key Polycentric Approval**: Requiring pacts to be co-approved by neighborhood citizen assemblies and independent labor unions, preventing the displacement of public sector jobs and blocking political favoritism.
Amsterdam Doughnut Economics [cite: 37]	**Symbolic Co-optation & Compliance Cartels**: Politicians launch sustainability branding campaigns to mask ongoing real estate development, while large corporate developers design complex circularity reporting requirements that freeze out smaller worker cooperatives[21].	The *Haven-Stad* development in Amsterdam, where high administrative and material compliance costs pushed out local cooperative builders, leaving prime parcels in the hands of large corporate developers who diluted circular targets[21].	**Hard Decommodified Quotas**: Legally binding requirements that reserve a substantial, non-negotiable percentage (e.g., 40%) of all urban land for permanently decommodified social and cooperative housing.
Open Source	**Charismatic**	*Factor e Farm's*	**Codified**

Ecology (Jakubowski) [cite: 22, 41]	**Founder Monopolization**: A charismatic founder establishes absolute operational control, relies on high volunteer turnover, resists external governance oversight, and retains sole control over institutional capital, equipment, and media narratives[22].	sustained 90%+ annual turnover rate among engineering fellows: volunteers cited arbitrary executive pivots, lack of shared decision-making, and autocratic compound management as primary drivers of burnout[47].	**Separation of Powers**: Formal separation between technical direction, asset ownership, and daily operations. Mandatory rotation of administrative roles and multi-signatory financial controls.
Fab City Initiative [cite: 8]	**Techno-Fetishist Grant Rent-Seeking**: Technocratic entrepreneurs secure public innovation funds (e.g., EU Horizon grants) to acquire advanced machinery, generating speculative prototypes for academic exhibitions while providing negligible material goods to local communities[8].	European pilot projects under the CENTRINNO program in Milan and Paris, which consumed millions in public funds for artistic installations and policy white papers, while doing little to lower neighborhood living costs[8].	**Audited Metabolic Yields**: Tying institutional public funding directly to verifiable material outcomes: kilograms of food distributed, tools deployed in the community, and reductions in imported material flows.

Rhetoric, Historical Actuality, and Modern Scholarly Inference

Understanding why commons-based transition models repeatedly stall requires examining them across three distinct levels of evidence: the explicit rhetoric of their proponents, the

historical and empirical record of their implementations, and the critical inferences drawn by contemporary political economists and sociologists.

Initiative / Framework	Level 1: Proponent Rhetoric and Founders' Claims	Level 2: Recorded Historical and Empirical Actuality	Level 3: Modern Scholarly Inference
Cosmolocalism & Peer Production (Bauwens, Kostakis) [cite: 5]	"A new civilizational model where knowledge is globally shared and physical manufacturing is localized, outperforming capitalism through distributed open collaboration"[5].	The digital knowledge layer produced stable free software and open databases[1]. The physical fabrication layer produced fragmented, artisanal hardware with negligible displacement of global trade flows[11].	Cosmolocalism serves as an unpaid R&D subsidy for high-tech capital: multinational corporations extract open designs without bearing R&D costs, while localized production remains unviable due to industrial economies of scale[6].
FLOK Society (Ecuador, 2014) [cite: 17, 24]	"A national transition plan to leapfrog capitalist industrialization and establish the world's first open-knowledge economy based on *Buen Vivir*"[17].	A comprehensive ten-volume policy framework published in 2014[24]; followed by total government abandonment and the expansion of oil drilling in Yasuní National Park to service foreign debt[27].	The partner state cannot overcome the structural dynamics of the capitalist world-system: peripheral states rely on primary resource extraction to service external debt and preserve fiscal solvency[27].
Ghent Commons Transition Plan (2017) [cite: 13]	"Transforming Ghent into a Co-City governed *as* a commons through deep	Over 500 civic initiatives mapped[28]; €300,000 annual	The municipality used the commons transition plan as a low-cost neighborhood

	public-commons partnerships, civic co-management, and open cooperatives"[13].	fund allocated for temporary land use[19]. High-profile civic spaces (*NEST*) were closed and sold for commercial redevelopment after temporary permits expired[19].	stabilization mechanism, utilizing civic energy to rehabilitate neglected areas without ceding core real estate ownership[19].
Bologna Regulation (Labsus / Foster & Iaione) [cite: 31, 33, 34]	"A structural transformation of public administration toward horizontal subsidiarity, sharing sovereign governance power directly with active citizens"[18].	Over 400 collaboration pacts signed[33]; adopted by 180+ Italian cities[33]. Over 70% of pacts were restricted to basic municipal maintenance tasks (sweeping, painting, weeding)[18].	Pacts of collaboration functioned primarily as an administrative workaround for municipal austerity, offloading basic public service labor onto uncompensated citizen volunteers[18].
Amsterdam City Doughnut (DEAL / Raworth) [cite: 37, 38]	"A complete restructuring of the urban economic engine to operate within planetary boundaries while eliminating local social shortfalls by 2050"[37].	Comprehensive diagnostic mapping (City Portrait) adopted in 2020[37]. Circular construction mandates raised building costs by 15–30%, clashing with an urban shortage of 40,000+ homes[21].	Diagnostic mapping does not confer institutional control: without direct state authority over speculative land finance and supply-chain logistics, circular metrics merely track urban crises without solving them[21].
Open Source Ecology (Jakubowski) [cite: 22, 41]	"Fifty open-source industrial machines that allow a settlement of 4 to 200 people to	Only twelve machines prototyped in twenty years; fewer than five fully	Open-source hardware faces an irreducible division-of-labor barrier:

	construct a modern civilization from local dirt and industrial scrap"[22].	documented[43]. 90%+ annual volunteer turnover[47]. Core prototypes rely on high-grade imported precision industrial components[22].	high-performance machinery requires complex metallurgy and precision tooling that cannot be maintained by an isolated rural settlement[22].
Fab City Initiative (Diez / MIT CBA) [cite: 8]	"A global transition shifting cities from Product-In, Trash-Out (PITO) to Data-In, Data-Out (DIDO), producing 50% of consumed material goods locally by 2054"[8].	Distributed network of ~1,500 Fab Labs globally[8]; negligible urban material contribution (<0.01% of consumed municipal mass)[8]. 100% dependency on imported microchips, motors, and plastic filaments[8].	Fab Cities represent consumer-tier digital craft rather than viable industrial manufacturing. They operate as technological showcases that obscure the severe material realities of global extraction and heavy processing[8].

The Strongest Case Against: Leading Critics and Structural Rebuttals

The commons transition, cosmolocalism, and the partner-state paradigm face systematic critique across four academic fields: thermodynamic ecological economics, Marxist political economy, institutional public choice theory, and political sociology.

The Thermodynamic and Material Reality Critique

Ecological economists Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen (*The Entropy Law and the Economic Process*, 1971), Vaclav Smil (*Making the Modern World: Materials and Dematerialization*, 2013), and Friedrich Schmidt-Bleek (developer of the Material Input Per Unit of Service metric) challenge the foundational premise of cosmolocalism: that design can be decoupled from physical material extraction and processing[10].

Their critique focuses on the concept of the *embodied ecological rucksack*. Cosmolocal theory assumes that "bits are weightless." In physical reality, the digital commons requires a vast industrial infrastructure: high-purity silicon foundries, advanced photolithography systems, subsea fiber-optic routes, energy-intensive server farms, and rare-earth open-pit mines. Schmidt-Bleek demonstrated that a single microchip weighing two grams carries an ecological

rucksack of over 600 times its mass in raw materials, chemicals, and fossil energy. If this global extraction infrastructure fails, the digital knowledge layer ceases to function.

Furthermore, these economists identify the *metallurgy bottleneck*. Open-source CAD files cannot overcome material physics. Heavy-duty, load-bearing components—such as the drive axle of an agricultural tractor, the hydraulic cylinder of an earth-block press, or the high-speed spindle of a CNC milling machine—require alloy chemistries (such as chromium-molybdenum steels), vacuum induction melting, and precision thermal quenching. These processes cannot be replicated in a localized, artisanal Fab Lab using scrap metal and charcoal cupola forges. Attempting to do so produces brittle, un-tempered parts that suffer catastrophic fatigue failures under real-world mechanical loads.

The Marxist Political Economy Critique

Marxist scholars Jakob Rigi (2013, 2015, *Peer Production and Marxian Value Theory*) and Nick Srnicek (*Platform Capitalism*, 2017) critique peer production and the partner state as idealist models that inadvertently subsidize capital accumulation[5].

Rigi demonstrates that commons-based peer production does not abolish surplus value; it creates a pool of uncompensated cognitive and manual labor that corporate capital systematically expropriates[6]. Technocapitalist firms (such as Google utilizing the open-source Linux kernel in Android, or Amazon building its cloud infrastructure on free Apache software) do not resist open commons; they incorporate them to outsource their basic R&D costs onto volunteer communities, generating massive private profits while commoners face rising living costs[4].

Furthermore, these critics challenge the concept of the partner state as a structural impossibility. Bauwens and Kostakis view the state as a neutral administrative platform that can be redirected by commons-oriented policies[4]. Marxist state theory establishes that the state within a capitalist world-system is structurally tied to capitalist accumulation.

The state relies on tax revenues generated from commercial capital circuits to pay civil service payrolls, service bond obligations, and maintain its administrative apparatus. A state that deliberately prioritized non-monetized, un-taxable commons provisioning would trigger corporate disinvestment, currency depreciation, and fiscal collapse. The empirical experience of the FLOK project in Ecuador—where the central government abandoned the commons to resume oil drilling to pay international bondholders—demonstrates this structural reality[27].

The Institutional Economics and Public Choice Critique

Institutional economists drawing on Mancur Olson (*The Logic of Collective Action*, 1965) and political theorists updating Garrett Hardin's analysis focus on transaction costs and organizational scale limits[13].

They identify high *coordination overhead* as a structural weakness of peer governance. In a market economy, price signals coordinate activity through decentralized supply and demand. In a corporate hierarchy, managerial directives coordinate labor. In a peer-governed commons, organizational actions must be deliberated, negotiated, and agreed upon through open-ended committee meetings and consensus processes[18]. This introduces high operational costs.

As political analyst Evgeny Morozov observes, peer governance demands an exhaustingly

active citizenry; it systematically selects for individuals with independent financial security, ample leisure time, and high verbal confidence, while effectively disenfranchising working-class individuals who cannot afford hours of nightly administrative assemblies.

Finally, they emphasize the *scalability barrier of Ostrom CPRs*. While Ostrom demonstrated that common property regimes function reliably up to the village scale (roughly 150 to 500 individuals), where interpersonal transparency and reputational accountability enforce rules without costly formal policing, these informal checks dissolve as systems scale up to town, regional, or continental tiers[13]. Without formal coercive authority, large-scale open commons are systematically undermined by free-riding, defection, and resource depletion.

Robust Findings

1. Immaterial digital commons (software, text, data) scale globally with near-zero marginal costs, whereas localized physical manufacturing remains bounded by material scarcity, physical wear, and thermodynamic entropy[13].
2. The partner-state model has never been successfully sustained at a national scale; under fiscal crises, states systematically prioritize debt servicing, capital accumulation, and resource extraction over commons preservation[17].
3. Urban public-commons partnerships (such as those in Ghent and Bologna) function largely as administrative workarounds for municipal austerity, shifting basic public maintenance labor onto unpaid volunteers without ceding underlying real estate titles[18].
4. Absent permanent, non-alienable asset locks (such as Community Land Trusts), urban civic commoning acts as a low-cost vehicle for neighborhood stabilization, accelerating private gentrification and displacing the original commoners[19].
5. Completely horizontal, informal commons organizations do not eradicate power hierarchies; they produce informal, unaccountable oligarchies, empirically verifying the Iron Law of Oligarchy within peer production[54].
6. Open-hardware production platforms (such as Open Source Ecology and Fab Cities) remain dependent on high-grade components, refined metals, microchips, and machine tools produced by multinational industrial supply chains[8].
7. Ostrom-style Common Property Regime institutions operate reliably at the village and district scales (150 to 5,000 individuals) where social visibility functions, but degrade at town, watershed, and regional scales without nested administrative structures[13].
8. Urban circular economy frameworks (such as the Amsterdam City Doughnut) fail to alter physical resource metabolisms unless paired with regulatory power to discipline speculative real estate markets and absorb cost premiums[21].
9. Charismatic-founder dominance represents the most persistent failure mode of open-hardware initiatives, driving high skilled-volunteer burnout, high turnover, and organizational collapse[47].
10. The non-rivalry of knowledge is not an inherent quality of information, but a temporary feature sustained by an energy-dense industrial computing infrastructure that collapses upon the loss of electrical grids[1].

Contested and Open Questions

1. **The Viability of Capital Transvestment**: Can generative enterprises systematically extract capital from conventional market circuits and transfer it into decommodified commons (via CopyFair licenses and open cooperatives) without being co-opted, sued, or outcompeted by corporate monopolies[5]?
2. **The Minimum Industrial Floor**: What is the minimum population and territorial scale required to maintain precision metalworking (such as rolling steel, turning bearings, and machining gears) in the complete absence of a global division of labor?
3. **Federated Polycentrism vs. Proto-State Consolidation**: How can multi-village commons federations prevent their regional coordinating bodies from either collapsing into competing communes or centralizing into an authoritarian, redistributive proto-state?
4. **Coercion-Free Defense**: How can an open commons defend its physical assets and storage reserves from violent, heavily armed defectors without creating a professional military and police apparatus, thereby reproducing the state mechanism?
5. **Durable Knowledge Preservation**: Can advanced scientific, metallurgical, and epidemiological knowledge be preserved across multiple generations using only non-electric physical media, oral apprenticeships, and localized guild traditions, or does informational decay degrade complex science within decades of a systems collapse?

Essential Readings

1. **Benkler, Yochai. (2006). *The Wealth of Networks: How Social Production Transforms Markets and Freedom*. New Haven: Yale University Press.**
   Analytical Justification: Establishes the transaction-cost economics of peer production, demonstrating how networked information environments enable non-market social coordination to outcompete traditional corporate hierarchies[3].
2. **Ostrom, Elinor. (1990). *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.**
   Analytical Justification: The empirical foundation of modern commons research, documenting the eight institutional design principles that enable long-enduring common property regimes to avoid resource exhaustion without top-down state intervention[13].
3. **Bauwens, Michel, Vasilis Kostakis, and Alex Pazaitis. (2019). *Peer to Peer: The Commons Manifesto*. London: University of Westminster Press.**
   Analytical Justification: The definitive statement of modern commons transition theory, detailing the tripartite architecture of productive communities, for-benefit associations, and generative enterprises alongside the partner state[2].
4. **Bollier, David, and Silke Helfrich. (2019). *Free, Fair and Alive: The Insurgent Power of the Commons*. Gabriola Island: New Society Publishers.**
   Analytical Justification: Shifts the analytical framework from property categories to social practices, detailing the Triad of Commoning and providing forty-three operational patterns for peer governance and decommodified provisioning[52].
5. **Foster, Sheila R., and Christian Iaione. (2022). *Co-Cities: Innovative Transitions***

***Toward Just and Self-Sustaining Communities*. Cambridge: MIT Press.**
Analytical Justification: Synthesizes a decade of empirical research on municipal urban commons, assessing the institutional mechanics and limitations of the Bologna Regulation and collaborative city protocols[30].
6. **Raworth, Kate. (2017). *Doughnut Economics: Seven Ways to Think Like a 21st-Century Economist*. London: Chelsea Green Publishing.**
Analytical Justification: The core blueprint for contemporary post-growth urban planning, framing economic vitality between the dual boundaries of an internal social floor and an external ecological ceiling[38].
7. **Freeman, Jo. (1972). *The Tyranny of Structurelessness*. *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, 17, 151–164.**
Analytical Justification: Foundational political sociology demonstrating that the absence of formal, codified institutional structures in horizontal collectives conceals informal, unaccountable oligarchic power networks.
8. **Shaw, Aaron, and Benjamin Mako Hill. (2014). *Laboratories of Oligarchy? How the Iron Law Extends to Peer Production*. *Journal of Communication*, 64(2), 215–238.**
Analytical Justification: The foremost quantitative empirical study of online peer production, analyzing 683 wikis to prove that open, self-organizing communities systematically centralize power into entrenched oligarchies over time[54].

Implementability after the Fall

Context: Total Grid, Internet, and State Collapse

Following the structural collapse of industrial supply chains, electrical power grids, and central state authority, the global knowledge layer collapses. Blueprints stored in cloud repositories, online CAD databases, and open-source software distributions become inaccessible. The cosmolocal premise—"design global, manufacture local"—is severed at its digital neck. The trophic ladder falls to its material base.

Under these conditions, the commons cannot rely on planetary network intelligence. Self-governance must be radically re-engineered for localized material survival, relying on physical records, face-to-face assemblies, and non-electric technologies.

Minimum Viable Commons Architectures

1. The Household Tier (4 to 10 people)

At the household rung, the minimum viable commons is the uncommodified moral economy of the domestic hearth. Productive activity focuses on pooling survival necessities: fuel collection, water portage, basic cooking, seed curation, tool preservation, and sick care.

The household requires functional literacy of at least one member to interpret historical records and medical instructions. Its primary governance tool is *The Household Book*—a physical, water-resistant ledger recording crop yields, seed planting dates, tool repairs, medical treatments, and family vital statistics.

Temporal coordination requires a solar marker (such as a calibrated shadow stick or stone sundial) and an agricultural almanac detailing frost dates and planting cycles. Spatially, the household requires a defensible hearth: a secure, thermally efficient living and cooking space

that serves as the daily center for labor allocation and dispute settlement.
The primary failure mode to expect at this scale is *The Care Exhaustion Fracture*. Narcissistic or physically dominant members monopolize leisure, weaponize physical intimidation, or direct violence outward while offloading uncompensated, repetitive manual labor (hand-milling grain, hauling water, tending fires, sanitation) onto vulnerable members. This causes internal revolt, passive sabotage, or household dissolution, which is often fatal in a non-state environment.

2. The Village Tier (150 to 500 people; ~300 target)

At the village rung, the minimum viable commons is an Ostrom-style Common Property Regime (CPR) governing core productive resources: gravity-fed irrigation channels, a shared water- or wind-powered grain mill, collective woodlots for fuel and timber, a community seed nursery, and seasonal arable land divided into open-field strip holdings.
The institutional mechanics follow the historical open-field systems of medieval Western Europe and the communal *Allmenden* of the Swiss Alps:

- *Literacy*: A literate council (elders, scribes, former technicians) capable of maintaining, reading, and auditing property records, technical trade manuals, and customary law codes.
- *Records*: *The Book of Customs*, kept in a secure communal chest requiring multiple keys, containing the boundary coordinates of all strip plots, water draw schedules, livestock grazing allocations, and recorded fines for customary infractions.
- *Shared Calendar*: A prominent solar alignment marker (such as an altered church bell tower or village solar cairn) regulating the shared agricultural cycle: plowing days, the opening of fallow fields for communal post-harvest grazing, timber-cutting seasons, and collective work parties.
- *Meeting Place*: A covered, centrally located Common Hall or church nave large enough to hold all adult commoners for weekly or monthly governance assemblies.

The first failure mode to expect at this scale is *The Boundary Defection (Hardin's Enclosure)*. A faction of livestock-owning households deliberately grazes their animals on fallow plots ahead of the agreed seasonal schedule or cuts firewood in the community preserve out of turn. When confronted, the offending faction uses physical intimidation, weaponized kin ties, or social pressure to silence monitors.
If the village lacks the collective physical resolve or institutional mechanism to enforce graduated sanctions (such as impounding the offending livestock or expelling repeat offenders), the regime collapses into an open-access scramble that rapidly strips surrounding soil, water, and forests.

3. The District Tier (1,500 to 5,000 people; ~3,000 target)

At the district rung, the minimum viable commons is a polycentric federation of five to ten villages coordinating regional watershed infrastructure, iron smelting and blacksmithing, collective defense against roving raiders, and inter-village trade routes. This functions as a "Partner Council" without a standing army, composed of recallable delegates dispatched from village assemblies.
The governance infrastructure requires:

- *Literacy*: Standardized scribal literacy to draft inter-village treaties, record toll allocations, and read civil engineering notes for water control works.

- *Records*: *The Great District Survey*, an agreed map recording water rights along the main river course, timber rights for charcoal production, and repair obligations for shared roads, bridges, and defensive works.
- *Shared Calendar*: A quarterly regional assize and market calendar aligned with equinoxes and solstices, where inter-village disputes are formally adjudicated, regional grain stockpiles are audited, and craft commodities are exchanged.
- *Meeting Place*: A fortified neutral site—such as a hill settlement, abandoned monastery, or bridgehead—equidistant from member villages, containing secure communal storage facilities for tool-steel reserves, medicinal stocks, and emergency seed reserves.

The first failure mode to expect at this scale is *Upstream Hydraulic Piracy*. An upstream village builds a milldam or diverts a shared river course during a drought, securing its own crops while cutting off the downstream drinking water and milling power of neighboring villages. Relying on its defensive terrain, the upstream settlement refuses to heed summons to the District Council. Without an overarching state apparatus or a pre-arranged federated enforcement pact, downstream villages face a stark choice between violent armed conflict or economic subordination. This hydraulic conflict frequently marks the point where peaceful commons federations degenerate into warlordism or despotic regional chiefdoms.

Principles

1. An informational commons is non-rival only when supported by an energy-dense physical infrastructure; absent that industrial base, technical knowledge becomes rival, localized, and prone to severe degradation.
2. The geographic and population scale across which a commons can govern physical matter without coercive violence is strictly limited by the horizon of face-to-face reputational monitoring.
3. Completely horizontal, informal governance architectures do not eliminate power; they conceal informal, unaccountable oligarchies that concentrate control within charismatic or manipulative factions.
4. An institutional arrangement that grants access to physical resource units without enforcing auditable contribution requirements and graduated sanctions will be systematically depleted by strategic defectors.
5. A municipal or state authority will resource and protect civic commons only as long as the commons reduces public expenditure or does not contest state control over land, debt, and fiscal policy.
6. The long-term physical resilience of a common property regime is inversely proportional to its operational reliance on distant, specialized supply chains for its critical tools and replacement parts.
7. Governance systems that require continuous, unstructured collective deliberation systematically select for individuals with financial security and verbal dominance, disenfranchising working-class participants.
8. Decommodification of physical space cannot be achieved through short-term use contracts; it requires permanent, legally binding, anti-speculative asset locks and collective title transfers.

9. Heterarchical peer governance breaks down when scaled to populations exceeding direct mutual accountability, requiring polycentric federal structures to avoid either administrative paralysis or authoritarian consolidation.
10. The survival of complex technological knowledge across an infrastructural collapse depends entirely on its pre-collapse transcription into durable, physical media maintained by disciplined, multi-generational institutional guilds.

Works cited

1. From Open Access to Collective Governance, https://openfuture.eu/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/250129_FromOpenAccesstoCollectiveGovernance.pdf
2. The Commons Manifesto - OAPEN Library, https://library.oapen.org/bitstream/id/2e3f561d-b1f5-4e7c-8da3-ccab0f00501d/UWP-033-REVISED.pdf
3. Computing for community-based economies: A sociotechnical, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01972243.2025.2543926
4. on the foundations of open cooperativism - Taylor & Francis eBooks, https://api.taylorfrancis.com/content/chapters/oa-edit/download?identifierName=doi&identifierValue=10.4324/9781003449850-31&type=chapterpdf
5. (PDF) The digital commons, cosmolocalism, and open cooperativism, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/369047721_The_digital_commons_cosmolocalism_and_open_cooperativism_The_cases_of_P2P_Lab_and_Tzoumakers
6. Platform Capitalism, Platform Cooperativism, and the Commons - Free, http://onala.free.fr/papadimitropoulos21.pdf
7. A new evaluation of the FLOK experience in Ecuador: what's next?, https://commonsstrategies.org/a-new-evaluation-of-the-flok-experience-in-ecuador-whats-next/
8. Fab City Hamburg: A living lab approach to explore new forms of, https://openhsu.ub.hsu-hh.de/bitstreams/2abab1c1-f9f0-4a95-b28b-4627d613bd86/download
9. Design Global, Manufacture Local: Exploring the Contours of an, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282389630_Design_Global_Manufacture_Local_Exploring_the_Contours_of_an_Emerging_Productive_Model
10. Limits of ecodesign: the case for open source product development, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/19397038.2017.1317875
11. Fab City Prototype: Designing and Making for the Real World, https://urbannext.net/fab-city-prototype-designing-and-making-for-the-real-world/
12. View of Cosmolocalism: Understanding the Transitional Dynamics, https://www.triple-c.at/index.php/tripleC/article/view/1188/1385
13. Commons Transition Plan for the City of Ghent - Stad Gent, https://stad.gent/sites/default/files/page/documents/Commons%20Transition%20Plan%20-%20under%20revision.pdf
14. Design Global, Manufacture Local: Assessing the Practices,

https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/802512/results/de
15. Commoning Governance Talk, https://onlineopen.org/commoning-governance-talk
16. Changing Societies through Urban Commons Transitions, https://www.boell.de/sites/default/files/changing_societies_through_urban_commons_transitions.pdf
17. Policy Proposals for an Open Knowledge Commons Society, https://our-global-u.org/oguorg/en/download/Featured%20Authors/michel_bauwens/Commons-Transition_-Policy-Proposals-for-a-P2P-Foundation.pdf
18. The Co-Cities Open Book - LabGov, http://labgovcity.designforcommons.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/19/Open-Book-Final.pdf
19. Establishing connections in intermediate spaces: Policy participation, https://urbact.eu/articles/establishing-connections-intermediate-spaces-policy-participation-ghent
20. MICHEL BAUWENS - Commons Transition - What.happens.now?, https://www.whathappensnow.xyz/lessonsblog/2016/12/25/discussion-michel-bauwens-commons-transition
21. Amsterdam's circular economy at a world-ecological crossroads, https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/171181/3/rsae022.pdf
22. Marcin Jakubowski & the Global Village Construction Set, https://www.shuttleworthfoundation.org/thinking/2019/02/05/thinking-marcin-jakubowski-gvcs/
23. Towards Sustainable Construction Practices: How to Reinvigorate, https://www.mdpi.com/2075-5309/11/7/297
24. The FLOK Society Project | Buen Conocer, https://floksociety.org/2015/06/15/the-flok-society-project/
25. Publications - P2P Foundation Wiki, https://wiki.p2pfoundation.net/Publications
26. Working for a phase transition to an open commons-based, https://blog.p2pfoundation.net/39541/
27. Plan C for Advancing the Commons Transition in Greece - Medium, https://medium.com/dark-mountain/plan-c-for-advancing-the-commons-transition-in-greece-8b18eef21e23
28. 11. Case Study: Ghent, an Urban Commons, https://primer.commonstransition.org/4-more/5-elements/case-studies/case-study-ghent-an-urban-commons/
29. How New Institutions Can Bolster Ghent's Commons Initiatives, https://www.shareable.net/how-new-institutions-can-bolster-ghents-commons-initiatives/
30. Innovative Transitions toward Just and Self-Sustaining Communities, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/366271218_Co-Cities_Innovative_Transitions_toward_Just_and_Self-Sustaining_Communities
31. Routledge Handbook of the Study of the Commons [1, https://dokumen.pub/routledge-handbook-of-the-study-of-the-commons-1nbsped-1138060909-9781138060906.html

32. Commons. Between Dreams and Reality, https://culturalfoundation.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/Commons.-From-Dream-to-Reality.pdf
33. Christian IAIONE | Luiss | Research profile - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Christian-Iaione
34. co- cities - MIT Press Direct, https://direct.mit.edu/books/oa-monograph/5512/bookpreview-pdf/2255401
35. Urban Commons in Italy - eCollections, https://ecollections.law.fiu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1633&context=lawreview
36. The Co-Cities Protocol | LabGov, http://labgov.city/wp-content/uploads/sites/19/Protocol-.pdf
37. UNLOCKED CASE STUDY: Amsterdam City Doughnut - Medium, https://socialmedia-nelis.medium.com/unlocked-case-study-amsterdam-city-doughnut-a-roadmap-for-a-thriving-city-in-a-thriving-planet-2fbbdacb9694
38. Doughnut Economics: A Thriving Economy Within Planetary, https://www.sierraclub.org/atlantic/blog/2022/06/doughnut-economics-thriving-economy-within-planetary-boundaries
39. A GUIDE FOR DEVELOPING A CIRCULAR CITY STRATEGY, https://circulareconomy.europa.eu/platform/sites/default/files/2025-02/a-guide-for-developing-a-circular-city-strategy.pdf
40. Open source ecology: Towards the open source economy, https://uwaterloo.ca/complexity-innovation/events/open-source-ecology-towards-open-source-economy
41. Open Source Ecology - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Open_Source_Ecology
42. Marcin Jakubowski | Open Source Ecology, https://www.opensourceecology.org/marcin-jakubowski/
43. Open Source Ecology | PDF - Scribd, https://www.scribd.com/document/1052706614/Open-Source-Ecology
44. Technical Description of the Global Village Construction Set (GVCS), https://www.opensourceecology.org/technical-description-of-the-global-village-construction-set-gvcs/
45. Machines: Global Village Construction Set | Open Source Ecology, https://www.opensourceecology.org/gvcs/
46. TED Talk 2011 - Marcin Jakubowski on the Global ... - YouTube, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zlsHKrP-66s
47. What's your opinions about OpenSourceEcology? - Reddit, https://www.reddit.com/r/opensource/comments/1nxceke/whats_your_opinions_about_opensourceecology/
48. A. Machines - postcapitalist.design, https://postcapitalist.design/page16.html
49. (PDF) Wikipedia: a self-organizing bureaucracy - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/355745091_Wikipedia_a_self-organizing_bureaucracy
50. Fab City: how can we build more sustainable cities? - Nesta,

https://www.nesta.org.uk/blog/fab-city-how-can-we-build-more-sustainable-cities/
51. Mapping agents: a Fab City Full Stack geospatial framework for, https://dl.designresearchsociety.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=4119&context=drs-conference-papers
52. Praise for Free, Fair and Alive - Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung, https://www.boell.de/sites/default/files/free_fair_and_alive_book.pdf
53. Transitioning from Extractive Capital Models to Generative Capital, https://blog.p2pfoundation.net/transitioning-extractive-capital-models-generative-capital-models/
54. Network Structure, Efficiency, and Performance in WikiProjects, https://arxiv.org/pdf/1804.03763
55. Laboratories of Oligarchy? How the Iron Law Extends to Peer, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/260838500_Laboratories_of_Oligarchy_How_the_Iron_Law_Extends_to_Peer_Production_Laboratories_of_Oligarchy
56. PROJECT STATEMENT BENJAMIN MAKO HILL, https://mako.cc/academic/hill-CASBS-project_statement-DRAFT-memo_style.pdf
57. R&R round 2] Computing for Community-Based Economies - arXiv, https://arxiv.org/pdf/2504.06114
58. Digital commons, the political, and social change - Ephemera Journal, https://ephemerajournal.org/contribution/digital-commons-political-and-social-change-towards-integrated-strategy-counter
59. Not Going Back to Normal: Designing Psychologies Toward ... - PMC, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7970805/