

# We'll See it When we Know it: Recognizing Emergent Solidarity Economy (Part 2)

by Matt Noyes

mn@rollingearth.org

@Matt\_Noyes@social.coop

In the dusk [the peak] loomed before him now as it had the first time he had glimpsed it from the broad and muddy Arkansas far out on the buffalo plains below: like something risen from the depths of dreamless sleep to the horizon of wakeful consciousness, without clear outline yet embodying the substance of a hope and meaning that seemed strangely familiar as it was vague.

- Frank Waters, Pikes Peak (Waters 1971, 1)

## I. Introduction

This is the second part of an article based on a 2016 online survey of organizations in El Paso County, Colorado whose practices, forms of organization, links, and strategies offer possibilities for social change and innovation in line with the broad concept of Solidarity Economy. The study was exploratory in nature, less about making a catalog of organizations in a well established ecosystem, than identifying the elements and contours of an emerging movement "without clear outline."

Part One examined the origin and uses of the term Solidarity Economy and offered a conceptual framework for researching emerging Solidarity Economy based on four key themes: Centrality of Labor, Planetary Crisis, Re-framing of Economy & Society, and Sector or Movement. Nine specific coordinates were used to identify Solidarity Economy organizations: Equity, Democracy, Sovereignty of Labor, Subordination of Capital, Cooperation & Intercooperation, Community, Protection & Recuperation of the Planet, Social Transformation, and Education.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The term coordinates comes from Ethan Miller: whereas "principles" typically define a model, "coordinates" serve

In Part Two we turn to concrete examples of Solidarity Economy at work – from childcare centers to ranches, private foundations to co-housing projects, building trades unions to a food rescue organization – and look for potential lines of cooperation and development, concluding with a list of tentative suggestions for further research, discussion, and action.<sup>2</sup>

The goal of this article is to inspire discussion of the concept of Solidarity Economy, and its underlying principles, among activists, organizers and social entrepreneurs in El Paso County, Colorado.

### **The Place: El Paso County**

El Paso County covers over 3,500 square miles on the eastern edge of the Rocky Mountains, between Denver and Pueblo. Its urban center is Colorado Springs, the state's second largest city, with a population of 663,519 that is about 70% White (non-Hispanic), 17% Hispanic/Latino, and 7% African-American. 11.5% of residents speak a language other than English at home. The poverty rate is 11% and average family income is \$58,206.<sup>3</sup>

The county's most prominent geographical feature is 14,302 foot Pikes Peak, the billion-year old mass of pink granite created in the massive uplift that formed the Rocky Mountains. The county's various streams feed Fountain Creek, a tributary of the Arkansas River which flows out to the "buffalo plains" described by local author Frank Waters.

Social landmarks include the sprawling Broadmoor Hotel, the luxury hotel complex owned by Denver billionaire Philip Anschutz, who also owns the local newspaper and the cog railway that runs up Pikes Peak; the US Olympic Training Center; and several military installations, including the Air Force Academy, the North American Air Defense Command, and U.S. Army base Fort Carson. (The three top employers in the county are military installations.) Colleges and universities

---

as points of discussion and debate. (Miller 2010)

<sup>2</sup>Thanks to Nat Stein for suggestions and corrections.

<sup>3</sup>Source: U.S. Census Bureau <http://www.census.gov/quickfacts/table/PST045215/08041>

include the private Colorado College, The University of Colorado at Colorado Springs, and Pikes Peak Community College.

Colorado Springs gained some recognition a decade ago with the publication of Eric Schlosser's best-selling book, and film, *Fast Food Nation*. Schlosser chose to focus on the city because:

“[Its] extraordinary growth... neatly parallels that of the fast food industry; during the last few decades, the city's population has more than doubled. Subdivisions, shopping malls, and chain restaurants are appearing in the foothills of Cheyenne Mountain and the plains rolling to the east. The Rocky Mountain region as a whole has the fastest-growing economy in United States, mixing high-tech and service industries in a way that may define America's workforce for years to come.”  
(Schlosser 2005, 7)

Known for its generally conservative politics (Trump won the county though he lost the state), the country is an important base of the “religious right” -- politically active, conservative evangelical Christian organizations whose leaders are "outspoken opponents of feminism, homosexuality, and Darwin's theory of evolution." (Schlosser 2005, 63) The same extremism has made its way into local government, though not without some resistance, in the form of an anti-tax “revolution.”<sup>4</sup>

So why look for solidarity economy in El Paso County? Normally, people interested in solidarity economy look to regions like Emilia-Romagna in Italy, the Canadian province of Quebec, or the Basque country of Spain. In the US, people might look to the Evergreen Cooperatives in Cincinnati, Cooperation Jackson, in Mississippi, or cities with multiple solidarity economy organizations like New York, Boston, or Berkeley. El Paso County seems to be a better place to look for obstacles to solidarity economy than opportunities.

But, if solidarity economy is to become a real alternative, it must find protagonists who will

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2017/06/30/colorado-springs-libertarian-experiment-america-215313>

cultivate roots even in the heartland of the Fast Food Nation. And, as this study documents, they are there for the finding. Unfortunately, while some of the organizations surveyed are well-known, many are not, perhaps not even to each other, and there is as yet no network that connects the diverse organizations on the basis of solidarity economy principles.<sup>5</sup> This article seeks to help prepare the ground for future studies and strategic discussions among practitioners and scholars seeking to transform the cultural, economic, and physical landscapes on the basis of solidarity.

## II. The Research Approach

The 2016 study posed these questions: to what extent do practices and principles consistent with solidarity economy exist? How many organizations are there? Where? In which industries, sectors, and communities do they work? Who is involved? What do they do and how are they organized? How large are they? What is their impact? Do they form inter-cooperative networks? How do they describe what they do and why they do it? Where is there potential for growth and development of solidarity economy?

The first obstacle to answering those questions was the lack of an existing directory or network. Nor were there previous studies on which to build. How to find the right people and organizations to survey? A modified version of the “Peer Esteem Snowballing Technique” (PEST) was used, a technique in which a representative sample of an unknown or “hidden” population is obtained through a series of nominations and re-nominations by “experts” in the field. (Christopoulos 2007) The resulting chain of “peer esteem” nominations generates a sample population and also reveals informal networks among individuals and organizations.

Initial contacts were recruited in an effort to include activities along the whole chain of the materials economy, from extraction and agriculture to production, distribution, consumption, and

<sup>5</sup> The national Solidarity Economy Mapping Project lists 48 organizations in El Paso County, all but one of them credit unions. The **Colorado Institute for Social Impact** (CI4SI) is building a network of “social impact” enterprises, and the **Center for Nonprofit Excellence** (CNE) publishes an annual directory of over 500 organizations, many of which appear in this study (including CNE itself).

disposal/recycling, in a wide range of industries, including agriculture, manufacture, education, healthcare, and housing, and including a variety of organizational forms, from consumer and worker cooperatives, to credit unions, non-profits, private companies, and labor organizations. Effort was made to recruit contacts active in a range of communities and with an eye to ethnic, linguistic, and other forms of diversity. Spanish and English versions of the survey were prepared, though no participants used the Spanish version. The survey opened on 10/19/2016 and closed on 11/16/2016. Out of one hundred people contacted in the snowballing process, forty completed surveys, of which thirty three were used.<sup>6</sup>

### III. The Results

The survey revealed a variety of organizations, active in every sphere of the solidarity economy, employing thousands of people.<sup>7</sup> Most are non-profit organizations, though various forms are used. There are several self-identified cooperative organizations, one of them -- **Ent Credit Union** -- very large, though most do not use one of the cooperative legal statuses available to them under Colorado State Law. A layer of secondary organizations that includes foundations, associations, and centers for innovation and entrepreneurship, provides support and resources to many of the groups surveyed.

Organizations support each other in various ways, chiefly through common projects, education, or joint work. They are also linked through networks of peer esteem and participation in social movements; several organizations act as hubs, linking organizations and communities.

At the same time, as mentioned earlier, the survey revealed gaps between networks, organizations and communities -- or, in more optimistic terms, possibilities for future networking and collaboration.

---

<sup>6</sup> The survey was carried out at the height of the 2016 U.S. Presidential elections, in which Colorado was a swing state; several organizations contacted replied that they had no time to spare.

<sup>7</sup> Please see Appendix 3.

## A. Organization Types and Spheres of Activity

Participants were asked to choose the categories that “best describe your organization and its work,” drawn from Ethan Miller’s “spheres of economic life,” and the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS)<sup>8</sup>. (The categories do not explicitly include non-market household production, a weakness that should be corrected in future research.) An additional category – Political Activism – was created when analyzing the data.<sup>9</sup>

There is activity in every sphere, mostly falling into three categories: Manufacture and Services; Agriculture, Consumption, and Food; and Finance and Administration. Table 1 shows the breakdown for each category. Items not selected by any respondents are included to show the types of activities often included in Solidarity Economy.

<b>Table 1: Spheres of Activity Agriculture, Consumer, and Food</b>	
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Organization(s)</b>
Agricultural Cooperative*	Frost Livestock Company; Arkansas Valley Organic Growers
Community Supported Agriculture (CSA)	Frost Livestock Company; Arkansas Valley Organic Growers; Ranch Foods Direct
Food and Grocery Cooperative*	BOCES
Food Rescue	Colorado Springs Food Rescue; Seeds Community Cafe; Ranch Foods Direct
Community farms & gardens	Venetucci Farm; Ranch Foods Direct; Seeds Community Cafe
Commons (land, design, software, seed)	Ranch Foods Direct
Composting	Ranch Foods Direct
Recycling	Blue Star Recyclers
Sliding scale or pay what you will	Seeds Community Cafe
Not Selected: <i>Consumer Cooperative, Community Land Trust, Gifts and Freecycling, Ethical Purchasing, Fair Trade</i>	

<sup>8</sup> See Miller 2010.

<sup>9</sup> The second US conference on “platform cooperativism” was held at the New School for Social Research in New York City in November, 2016. The next survey of solidarity economy in El Paso County should include this important new area of cooperative innovation.

\*Note: The term “cooperative” is ambiguous as organizations that identified themselves cooperatives may not use the cooperative legal form, or even a typical cooperative organizational structure.

### Energy and Utilities

Activity	Organization(s)
Other: Energy Efficiency	Energy Resource Center
Not Selected: <i>Energy/Telecom Cooperative, Renewable Energy Cooperative, Utility or Electrical Cooperative Association, Water Cooperative</i>	

### Manufacture and Services

Activity	Organization(s)
School or other Educational Institution	Thrive; Quad Innovation Partners
Artist or Artisanal Cooperative	Commonwheel Artists Co-operative
Freelancer Cooperative	Epical Co-working
Other: Work Space	Epical Co-working
Other: We are a group that provides education to professionals, high school students and parents on the achievement gap, diversity issues, SAT prep, etc.	Educating Children of Color
Other: Political	Student Government Association, University of Colorado at Colorado Springs
Other: Startup Ecosystem Non-profit	Peak Startup
Other: Advanced Manufacturing	TechWears
Other: Education for Non-profits	Leadership Pikes Peak
Not Selected: <i>Taxi, Transportation; Tool Library; Tourism; Study Group</i>	
Note: The inclusion of education in the manufacturing and services category was confusing to at least one respondent; this is a weakness in the survey design.	

### Healthcare, Childcare, Housing

Activity	Organization(s)
Childcare Cooperative	Ruth Washburn Cooperative Nursery School
Housing Cooperative or Co-Housing	Casa Verde
Not Selected: <i>Shelter, Homecare Cooperative, Elderly Care Cooperative, Healthcare Coverage Cooperative /Medical Insurance Cooperative<sup>10</sup></i>	

### Finance and Administration

Activity	Organization(s)
----------	-----------------

<sup>10</sup> In 2015, Colorado HealthOp, a healthcare insurance cooperative created after the passage of the Affordable Care Act in 2010, went out of business due to a reduction in government funding.  
<http://www.denverpost.com/2015/10/16/colorado-healthop-shut-down-by-state-regulators-amid-cash-reserve-woes/>

Cooperative Support Organization (provides support or services to cooperatives)	Rocky Mountain Farmers Union; Colorado Coalition for Social Impact; Ranch Foods Direct; Rocky Mountain Employee Ownership Center*
Cooperative Bank or Credit Union	Ent Credit Union
Other: We are a local community hub for all resources nonprofit related.	Center for Nonprofit Excellence
Other: We are a multipurpose grant making foundation	El Pomar Foundation
Other: We promote and support any/all [businesses] that are or are going to be employee owned; School or other; Childcare Cooperative, Homecare Cooperative; Educational Institution, Taxi, Transportation. We work with Labor Unions to encourage them to start union worker cooperatives.	Rocky Mountain Employee Ownership Center
Other: [Promote and support Social Enterprises and other social impact businesses]	Colorado Coalition for Social Impact
Other: Trade Association for Credit Unions	Mountain State Credit Union Association
Not Selected: <i>Community Development Credit Union, Local or Community Currency, Purchasing Cooperative (non-food products), Social Investment Fund</i>	
* RMEOC did not select this item, but listed support for cooperatives under “Other.”	
<p align="center"><b>Labor Organizations (501(c)(5) organizations, including labor unions, apprenticeship programs, legal defense funds, and hiring halls.)</b></p>	
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Organization(s)</b>
Labor Union	International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 113; United Association of Plumbers and Pipefitters; Colorado Springs Area Labor Council
Not Selected: <i>Other Labor Organization, Community-based Workers Center, Informal Workers Organization (caucus, club, committee)</i>	
<p align="center"><b>Political Activism*</b></p>	
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Organization(s)</b>
Various**	Showing Up for Racial Justice (SURJ)
Various**	Student Government Association, University of Colorado at Colorado Springs***
Not Selected: <i>Other Labor Organization, Community-based Workers Center, Informal Workers Organization (caucus, club, committee)</i>	
* This was not a question on the survey, but is included here to reflect the activity of two organizations whose activity is not described by those listed under “Type of organization.” Future surveys of solidarity economy should include this category.	
**Both SURJ and the <b>Student Government Association at UCCS</b> are active in a variety of social movements. See the Network of Social Participation.	
*** <b>The Student Government Association at UCCS</b> is listed here, as well as in Manufacture and Services, because the respondent identified political activism as their main activity.	



### C. Tax Status: mostly non-profits

In terms of tax status, the majority of organizations surveyed here are registered as non-profit corporations. Four are private for-profit companies or corporations, three are labor organizations, and three have no formal legal status. The three remaining organizations are a private company, a credit union, and an agricultural cooperative.<sup>11</sup>

### D: Scale and Impact:

#### 1. Annual Revenue

The size and economic impact of the organizations surveyed was gauged by considering their annual revenue and number of employees. The organizations surveyed range from **Ent Credit Union**, which reported an operating income for 2016 of \$181,176,219, and assets of \$4,738,488,092<sup>12</sup> to **Friends of Monument Valley Park**, with a 2016 revenue of \$74,440 and assets of \$126,076. (Because of its size and mixed cooperative structure, **Ent** is in many ways an outlier in this survey.) Most of the organizations reported incomes of less than \$500,000 a year.

#### 2. Number of Employees

Because employment is one of the primary ways cooperatives and other Solidarity Economy organizations help build communities and make economic justice a reality for workers the survey included a series of questions about work and workers, beginning with the number of people working in the organization.

Solidarity Economy includes a wide variety of activities and work, not all of which is paid, so the survey asked for an estimate of the total number of people employed in all capacities, including volunteers. The most striking result is that the majority of organizations have fewer than thirty employees, nearly one third have fewer than five, suggesting a limited impact on employment.

<sup>11</sup> See the interactive table in Appendix 3

<sup>12</sup> Statement of Condition, 12/2016 <https://www.ent.com/assets/files/sLQlg3xv/2017/01/11/Stmt%20of%20Condition%20December%202016.pdf>

The organization that listed the most employees was Local 113 of the **International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW)**, which counted its 1,100 members as volunteers. (The other two labor organizations surveyed, **Plumbers and Pipefitters Local 38**, and the **Colorado Springs Area Labor Council**, counted only their paid union staff.) While the rate of participation of members in the activities of Local 113 is unknown, as a voluntary membership organization financed by member dues, it seems reasonable to count all union members as volunteers. The voluntary character of labor unions, combined with their direct connection to employment and their power to bargain collectively, makes unions an important potential source of strength for workers in the Solidarity Economy.

### 3. Paid Employees

When we consider paid employees, we see a different pattern. Only one organization, **Ent Credit Union**, reported more than one hundred paid employees (668 paid employees).<sup>13</sup> The majority employ ten or fewer.

The organizations reporting the highest proportion of *full-time* paid employees were **Care and Share Food Bank** – 100% (40/40 employees); **Ranch Foods Direct** – 95% (40/42 employees); and **Ent Credit Union** – 95% (638/668 employees), while the organizations with the highest proportion of *part-time* employees were: **Commonwheel Artists Co-op** – 100% (2/2 employees); **Blue Star Recyclers** – 68% (26/38 employees)<sup>14</sup>; and **Colorado BOCES Association** – 60% (3/5 employees).

Unpaid employees can include volunteers and/or unpaid interns. In addition to **IBEW 113**, **which** has both a high number and high percentage of volunteers – 99% (1,100/1,103); **Leadership**

<sup>13</sup> In comparison, total employment in the finance sector in El Paso County in 2015 was 19,191. <https://tinyurl.com/ybyvvu4j>

**Ent** is the largest El Paso County-based financial institution. The largest private sector employer in El Paso County, UC Health Memorial Hospital, has over 3,900 employees. <http://gazette.com/memorial-hospitals-in-colorado-springs-have-new-president-ceo/article/1590451> )

<sup>14</sup> In part this is due to a perverse incentive: if people who receive social security disability benefits earn over a certain amount they may lose their benefits.

**Pikes Peak**, – 98% (300/304); **Standing Up for Racial Justice (SURJ)** – 100% (12/12) and several other organizations reported high levels of volunteering.

#### **4. Consultants/Contractors**

The organizations that hire the most consultants and or contractors as a proportion of paid staff are: **Commonwheel Artists Co-op** – 94% (36/38); **Techwears.com** – 60% (3/5); and **Epicentral Co-Working** – 50% (2/4). The thirty-six members of **Commonwheel Artists Co-op** are “employed” as independent contractors, and hire an office staff of two part-time employees.

## **IV. Coherence with Solidarity Economy Coordinates and Concepts**

Before assessing the results, it is important to underscore two limits of the survey. To begin with it was not intended to serve as a social balance sheet for evaluating or assessing the organizations’ performance. A proper self-assessment tool, of the type developed by organizations like REAS in the Basque Country or Xarxa de la Economía Social, in Barcelona, Spain, would need to be created in collaboration with the organizations themselves.

Second, the survey was conducted in October/November, 2016. The political and organizational context changed in the wake of the 2016 election, and the organizations surveyed have continued to evolve (two have gone out of business), so the conclusions drawn can only be considered tentative and in need of update.

Nonetheless, by considering the degree of coherence of the organizations surveyed with the coordinates and concepts laid out in Part One we can establish a kind of rough map of the Solidarity Economy, in which the gaps are as informative as the correspondences.

## A. Coherence with the Nine Coordinates of Solidarity Economy

For each coordinate, we will look first at what one might expect to find in a Solidarity Economy then the actual results.

### 1. Equity (includes open and voluntary membership)

One indicator of equity would be a high level of diversity in the organization's staff and membership, relative to the county population, with clear evidence of inclusion of excluded groups and focus on work with communities that suffer current and/or historical discrimination. One would expect to see policies on diversity that set goals and ensure accountability in organizations. One would also expect to see cultivation of inclusive social networks (contacts, partners) and participation in social movements in which equity is a central concern.

#### *Results:*

The racial and ethnic composition of the respondents was less diverse than that of the population of El Paso County as a whole, which is 70.1% White; 16.3% Hispanic; and 5.5% Black.<sup>15</sup> Survey respondents were 83.8% White and 2.7% each Hispanic and Black.<sup>16</sup> Just over half of the respondents were female and over 90% hold a leadership position in their organization. (Manager or Executive 40.5%; Executive Director or Boss 35.1%; Board Member 13.5%).

Respondents were asked to identify the communities with which the organizations work, but they interpreted the term "community" in one of three ways: as *populations or categories of people* (farmers, people of color, residents of rural areas, low income people, seniors, the disabled, homeless people); as *geographic areas served* (from the international to specific neighborhoods); or as *the community created by the organization itself*, (e.g. **Casa Verde**, the co-housing community). So it is difficult to determine to what extent organizations surveyed are focusing on work with

<sup>15</sup> As of 2014. Source: DataUSA, via the U.S. Census Bureau. <https://datausa.io/profile/geo/el-paso-county-co/#demographics>

<sup>16</sup> Respondents were asked to self-identify by "race or ethnicity." They identified as: "White" 40.5%; "Caucasian" 35.1%; "White non-Hispanic" 2.7%; "Gringo" 2.7%; "Black" 2.7%; and "Hispanic" 2.7%; and "European" 2.7%.

communities that suffer current and/or historical discrimination.

While the majority of organizations indicated that they have written policies on diversity and inclusion, most do not make them public. Transparency, including making information available to the public, is an important element of accountability.

The responses to questions about Partner Organizations mostly indicate functional or operational partnerships, e.g. with customers or funders, as opposed to a strategic effort to cultivate inclusive social networks.

On the other hand, the social movements in which equity is a central concern are the ones in which the largest number of organizations participate. It would be important in future research to look more closely at equity issues within organizations and in their social and organizational networks.

## **2. Democracy (transparency)**

In the case of Solidarity Economy one would expect to see the use of organizational and legal forms that support democratic participation and control, such as cooperatives, collectives, and employee owned firms. Along with education, transparency, reflected in availability of information to employees, members, and the community, is an important element of democratic practice. High levels of worker and member participation in governance and management are other indicators of democracy.

### *Results:*

As we have seen, the vast majority of organizations surveyed are not cooperatives, collectives, or employee-owned. Most are not membership organizations.

As mentioned above, there is insufficient transparency, despite the fact that Internet technology

makes it easy to share organization policies, financial information, meetings minutes, etc.<sup>17</sup> (Non-profit organizations have a legal obligation to provide basic financial information to the government and labor unions have extensive reporting obligations. These records are available to the public, but require searching.<sup>18</sup>) Of the groups surveyed that do have publicly available policies, only one provided extensive information that is easily accessed online: on its website the **Ruth Washburn Cooperative Nursery School** provides school guidelines, a statement on diversity, and copies of the minutes of board meetings.<sup>19</sup>

We see the following patterns of participation of workers and customers/users in governance:

- Nearly 2/3 of organizations report **worker participation** in governance and management, though only twenty percent of organizations report a high degree of worker participation.
- **Worker membership** is found in about half of the responding organizations, with nearly all of those organizations reporting that most workers are members.
- **Worker ownership** – a key to labor sovereignty and capital subordination – is less common, reported by fewer than twenty percent of organizations. Where worker ownership occurs, all or most workers share ownership.
- **Customer participation** in governance and management is found in a minority of organizations, most with low levels of participation.

---

<sup>17</sup> Just under half of the responding organizations make their Annual Financial Reports available, and only 34.3 % make them available online. The charter and/or bylaws (indispensable for members who wish to know their rights within the organization and those outside who want to understand its governance) are publicly available in fewer than half the organizations, online in just 20%. Minutes from meetings are available in 28.6% of organizations, online in just 5.7%.

<sup>18</sup> Not-for-profit corporations (62.5% of the organizations surveyed here) are required by law to file annual financial statements. (Most are available online via Guidestar.org.) Under the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act, Labor Unions are required to file annual financial reports and copies of their bylaws or constitutions as well. (See the Office of Labor Management Standards <https://www.dol.gov/olms/>) Cooperatives must file articles of incorporation and periodic updates, available from the state government.

<sup>19</sup> See <https://rwncs.org/> One of the best models for this type of transparency that I have seen is the Hunger Mountain Food Coop, in Montpelier Vermont.

- **Customer membership** is the main form of participation for users and customers, with nearly half of the organizations reporting some customer-members, though only seventeen percent of organizations indicating a high percentage of members.
- The number of organizations reporting **customer ownership** is a bit lower, again with low ownership levels.

In sum, robust participation of workers and customers as members, owners, and participants in governance and management is generally low, with most organizations reporting no participation in all but one category: worker participation in governance and management. The organizations reporting high levels of worker participation are a labor organization, a credit union, a cooperative using a private company form, a student organization, a private company and two non-profit corporations.

Nonetheless, the answers to this question underscore the impact that cooperative organizations like **Ent Credit Union** can have in terms of participation in membership, ownership, and governance. In each category **Ent** is at the top of the range. Cooperative forms and practices generate worker membership, ownership, and participation. At the same time, the results suggest that participation in governance and management may be developed in non-cooperative businesses and organizations, where ownership and membership are not present. This raises interesting questions about the content of participation in governance and management and the degree to which workers participate with real power and protagonism.

### 3. Sovereignty of Labor

Sovereignty of Labor implies not only worker ownership, but decision-making power and control. The first indicator to look for is worker-ownership and membership, that is, some kind of institutional power. Obviously, worker cooperatives are well suited to labor sovereignty. But while

formal status in the organization is important, but actual participation is also crucial – to what degree do workers participate in governance and management? Effective participation requires democratic functioning and equal access to information, transparency. Organizations might adopt policies to promote and ensure labor rights, equity, and transparency. There is a material basis to sovereignty of labor as well: sustainable jobs, full-time, decent pay, and the creation of employment. This is especially important in communities of color and for all groups who have faced exclusion and exploitation. Finally we would expect to see participation in social movements directly tied to workers rights and organization: support for union struggles, living wages, and other campaigns that affect workers in their relationship to capital. Collaboration with and support for labor organizations should be a key part of the organization’s mission, education, and activism.

*Results:*

Sovereignty of Labor is the weakest point in the emerging Solidarity Economy in El Paso County. As we saw above, while two-thirds of organizations surveyed indicated some participation of workers in governance and management, fewer than half have worker-members, and fewer than one in five have worker-owners. None of the organizations use the worker cooperative legal form. Most organizations do not have written policies on labor and, as we saw, where there are policies they are mostly not made public. Just 11% of the organizations surveyed reported participation in workers or labor movements as such (workers rights, Labor Movement), the exceptions being the labor unions and the **Rocky Mountain Farmers Union**.<sup>20</sup> Other movements, for example immigrant rights, overlap to a large extent with workers movements, and the networks of participation generated by the survey reflect this intersectionality, but the apparent isolation of labor or workers movements as such represents a real weakness and an area of missed opportunities.

<sup>20</sup> Mondragón founder Jose Maria Arizmendiarieta conceived of cooperativism as a leading element (“*un elemento de vanguardia*”) of a larger workers movement (Azurmendi 1991 p799). The workers movement he envisioned transcended the self-limiting “possibilism” of labor unions focused on immediate demands, by organizing for full workers control. At the same time, he stressed the importance of worker organization and solidarity with labor unions in the face of capitalist control over production.



#### 4. Subordination of Capital

There is no sovereignty of labor without capital subordination, but the reverse is not necessarily true. Various legal forms – credit unions, cooperatives, employee-owned firms, non-profit organizations – specifically restrict the power and influence of capital in the ownership, governance, and management of organizations. Just as with sovereignty of labor, the legal form is not enough. Organizations must ensure that capital is subordinated in practice by ensuring democratic practices.

##### *Results:*

The organizations surveyed have by and large chosen forms and practices that weaken capital and restrict its role in the organization. While there are few cooperatives and no employee-owned firms, most are 501(c)(3) non-profit corporations, with no outside investors or stockholders. (Although foundations often have an important influence in non-profits.) While non-profit status restricts the role of capital it can also inhibit the creation of wealth and stable employment in the community, a key element of Solidarity Economy. The ability to generate wealth makes cooperatives a useful form. Finally, the role of capital in **Ent Credit Union** should be further studied – to what extent does **Ent**, a cooperative organization, provide access to capital for businesses whose main objective is capital accumulation? What role could it play in developing sources of funding for cooperatives and other organizations? What obstacles stand in the way of creating vehicles for funding cooperatives and other Solidarity Economy projects?

#### 5. Cooperation (and inter-cooperation)

Cooperation, often in the form of cooperative businesses, is the typical organizational principle of Solidarity Economy. Worker, producer, consumer, energy, housing, and creator cooperatives, as well as credit unions, land trusts, and other forms of commons are all forms one might expect to find, in addition to less common forms like transition towns, time banks, and alternative currencies.

Employee-owned enterprises, which typically do not go as far as cooperatives in terms of worker-ownership and democratic governance, are another likely form.<sup>21</sup>

In some cases, such as the Green Taxi Cooperative in Denver, Colorado, cooperatives are launched or supported by non-profit organizations or labor organizations (another way in which the connection to labor can be important). Because Solidarity Economy is an ecosystem, we are also looking for inter-cooperation, cooperation among organizations. We would expect to find partnerships among organizations, various forms of mutual support, and the presence of organized networks linking organizations. Organizations might make a point of using each other's services or products, sharing resources, including representatives from other groups as stakeholders, and collaborating in shared social movement activities.

*Results:*

As we saw, of the 33 organizations surveyed, six identified themselves as cooperatives: **Arkansas Valley Organic Growers (AVOG), Casa Verde Co-Housing, Colorado BOCES Association, Common Wheel Artists Cooperative, Ent Credit Union, and Ruth Washburn Childcare Cooperative.** Colorado State law recognizes many types of cooperative: Worker Cooperatives, Producer, Consumer, and Purchasing Cooperatives, Limited Cooperative Associations (UCLAA). There are cooperative forms for Renewable Energy, Housing, and Healthcare Cooperatives.<sup>22</sup> But only **Ent** and **AVOG** use a cooperative legal form; a question for further research is why these forms are under-utilized.

Moreover, as the survey shows, cooperatives and other forms of employee-owned business are supported by several second-tier organizations that provide organizing, educational, and financial

---

<sup>21</sup> See for example the New Belgium Brewing Company in Fort Collins, Colorado which turned to employee-ownership in recent years to fend-off acquisition by large corporations:  
<http://www.bizjournals.com/denver/news/2015/09/25/craft-brewery-employee-ownership-grows-as.html>

<sup>22</sup> For a simple introduction see the Colorado page on the Co-opLaw.org website. <http://www.co-oplaw.org/statebystate/colorado/>

support to cooperatives and employee-owned businesses, including The **Rocky Mountain Farmers Union**, The **Mountain West Credit Union Association**, and the **Rocky Mountain Employee Ownership Center**. This capacity for infrastructure support is important for future development.

Where cooperatives exist, they can have important social and financial impact, as seen in the case of **Ent Credit Union**. Ent is the largest employer, with the most full-time workers, the most assets, and the highest level of worker and customer participation in governance and management. It also has the most work locations, in various communities.

Inter-cooperation is seen in part in the partnership network generated from survey results. Respondents were asked to identify up to five of their organization's "principal partners" or "main collaborators." The Partnership Network chart reveals three patterns of connection.<sup>23</sup>

- *Organizational clusters*: the majority of organizations can be divided into two main clusters of partnerships: food and agriculture, and education and innovation.
- *Hub organizations*: **Colorado Springs Food Rescue** is an important hub, directly linked to many organizations and networked with the agricultural, university, and entrepreneurship and innovation clusters. Other hubs are: the **Center for Nonprofit Excellence, Educating Children of Color, Inc., Arkansas Valley Organic Growers**, and **Blue Star Recyclers**. The Public School Districts also form an important network through which many organizations are linked.
- *Bridges*: **Quad Innovation Partnerships, Colorado Coalition for Social Impact, Thrive Colorado Springs**, and **Ranch Foods Direct** each occupy key bridging positions, linking partnership clusters.

Interestingly, the self-identified cooperative organizations did not indicate inter-cooperation

---

<sup>23</sup> See the link to the full interactive chart in Appendix 2.

with cooperatives outside of their immediate sector: the credit union organizations cooperate, as do the agricultural organizations, but neither indicated partnership or support with each other or to childcare, co-housing, and education support cooperatives.

Respondents were also asked to choose from a list of types of support that groups might offer to their partners. Of particular interest are the forms of support that imply a significant commitment of resources: material resources, staff, and financial resources. The last type is especially important because of the difficulty cooperatives and other alternative projects face in obtaining financing through traditional means.

The most common forms of support provided are Joint Work, Advice or Consultation, and Education. Fewer than half of the organizations surveyed provide Material Resources or Staff, and just four provide Financial Resources. Most organizations in the Agricultural, Consumer, and Food sector provide three or more forms of support to their partners. The **Energy Resource Center** (Energy Sector) and **Plumbers and Pipefitters Union** (Labor) listed six and four types of support respectively.

Of the six organizations in the Financial and Administrative sector that responded, one, the **El Pomar Foundation**, listed Financial Resources as a type of support provided to partners. Three listed Advice or Consultation and the other two indicated support in the form of Joint Work. Two organizations – The **Rocky Mountain Employee Ownership Center** and the **Center for Non-Profit Excellence** – listed three or more types of support.

It is important to distinguish here between the support provided by second-tier organizations – groups created for that purpose, such as the **Center for Non-Profit Excellence**, **Leadership Pikes Peak**, and **Colorado Coalition for Social Impact** (now Colorado Institute for Social Impact) – and the support “first-tier” organizations provide directly to each other. Inter-cooperation requires both

forms of mutual support and participation.<sup>24</sup>

Most organizations are members of a formal network or joint organization, the largest networks being those to which the labor unions, farmers union, and the credit union belong. But even small organizations are often part of regional and national networks. Again, the labor unions are distinctive in that the regional and international unions of which they are affiliates have democratic governance structures backed up by legal protections for members rights and exercise significant power in collective bargaining with corresponding employer's associations.

Finally, more than half of the organizations indicated that they include representatives from other groups as stakeholders, and participate in the some of the same social movement activities, though it is not clear to what extent they collaborate in those movements. In sum, while there are various forms of support and collaboration among organizations, inter-cooperation is underdeveloped.

## **6. Community (solidarity and development)**

Because Solidarity Economy rejects the separation of the social from the economic, community is integral. The mission of Solidarity Economy is to create equitable and democratic communities and social-economies.

Creation of employment – jobs that are livable and humane – is crucial for community development, so labor and employment are also important community considerations from this point of view.

One would expect to see that organizations have a strategic definition of community, that they identify communities in which to work based on larger Solidarity Economy goals of social

---

<sup>24</sup> The highly developed “second-tier” support structures of the Mondragón Corporation in the Basque Country of Spain, a model of inter-cooperation, rest on a strong base of “first-tier” mutual support and shared resources: cooperatives in the same industry may share profits, employees, and R&D costs, for example. (Altuna Gabilondo 2008)

transformation. Customers or users should play a larger role than in traditional organizations and the organizations surveyed should be active in social movements important to their communities.

*Results:*

As mentioned above, the survey question about community was ambiguous, but we do know that most of the organizations surveyed consider community members to be stakeholders and that many include work with specific communities in their mission statements. **Educating Children of Color**, for example, has a clearly stated focus on children of color and children in poverty. **Blue Star Recyclers** makes employment of people on the Autism spectrum, over 75% of their employees, part of their core mission.

Another way to think about community is in terms of customers or users. Just over half of the responding organizations have customer-members, the largest being **Ent Credit Union** with its 244,741 consumer members. Organizations with high levels of customer-membership also report high numbers of volunteers. Excluding **IBEW Local 113** (which has no customers and reported all members as volunteers), we find that the five organizations reporting 75% - 100% customer-membership employ nearly half of all volunteers. In consumer cooperatives like **Ent Credit Union**, members are also owners, with rights to participation in governance and ownership.

## 7. Protection and Recuperation of the Planet

From the beginning, Solidarity Economy has developed together with notions of environmental protection and sustainable practices.<sup>25</sup> William Morris's 1890 *News from Nowhere* is as much a depiction of recuperated waterways and sustainable agriculture as it is an account of transformed social relations. (Morris 1890) The growth of modern industrial capitalism, and of the productivist industrial socialist states, is the prime cause of the most urgent problem of our time: the multi-

---

<sup>25</sup> Jay Frost, a rancher in Fountain, Colorado, who is active in conservation and water use issues sees the term "sustainable" as vague. For reasons explained here, I find "protection and recuperation" a better term.

dimensional crisis known as climate change or global warming. If, as Naomi Klein has said, “this changes everything” we would expect to see a concern with climate change reflected in the organization types – for example, recycling, water, and other sustainable practices – as well as participation in environmental and related social movements, and the adoption of environmental policies at the organization level. A clear statement of priority in the organization's mission would be another sign of commitment to protection and recuperation.

*Results:*

Ten organizations can be said to be involved in protection and recuperation of the planet, food security, organic farming, or food rescue. Four of them are producers: **Frost Livestock Company, Venetucci Farm, Arkansas Valley Organic Growers, and Ranch Foods Direct/Peak to Plains Food Distributing**. The others are: **Care and Share Food Bank, Colorado Springs Food Rescue, Bluestar Recyclers, Energy Resource Center, Friends of Monument Valley Park, and TechWears**, an “eco-fashion” manufacturer. Nineteen of the organizations surveyed listed participation in environmental and related movements (recycling, organic farming, food security, animal welfare, etc.). Environmental and Climate Justice is the social movement with the most participating organizations, fourteen out of thirty three, and eight organizations have specific statements about environmental protection in their mission statements or organization descriptions.

Clearly, the effects of the climate crisis are a concern to most of the organizations surveyed. What is not clear from the results is how protection and recuperation of the planet fit into the strategic visions of the organizations. Further discussion and research is needed.

## **8. Social Transformation**

The practice of equity, democracy, labor sovereignty, capital subordination, cooperation, community development, and protection and recuperation of the environment, amount to a project

of broad and deep change in the basic structures, practices, and ideologies of modern society and economy. The articulation of a strategy of fundamental social transformation in the organization's mission statement or self-description, and an effort to create the structures or networks necessary to organize a movement of movements, would be signs of a strategy of social transformation.

*Results:*

Respondents were asked to describe their organization or project's "goals and main areas of work." Nearly every organization has some kind of mission statement that describes their goals and the range of activities in which they are involved. For example,

- **Care and Share Food Bank:** "Care and Share is the sole food bank serving 31 southern Colorado counties. We provide emergency food to 300 partner agencies reaching food insecure people in our region."
- **Rocky Mountain Farmers Union:** "We aim to build a more just, healthy, thriving and inclusive economy through cooperative enterprises in Colorado, New Mexico and Wyoming."
- **Ice House Colorado Springs:** "Ice House Colorado Springs is an exciting community roll out of the Ice House Entrepreneurship Program. Our goal is to spread the entrepreneurial mindset throughout the Pikes Peak region by providing tools to unlock human potential and create transformational change within our community."

Interestingly, though there is no network of Solidarity Economy projects, there is one organization – **Colorado Institute for Social Impact** – working to develop a network of "fourth sector" organizations, for profit and non-profit businesses focused on "social impact."

As several mission statements reflect, education and innovation are central to the strategy of most organizations surveyed.



## 9. Education and Innovation

Education lies at the heart of Solidarity Economy. This takes the form of explicit educational activities: workshops and classes, training and apprenticeship, study groups and research projects. But it also includes the practice of democracy, equity, and solidarity in organizing social-economic activity: learning solidarity by practicing solidarity.

Innovation has a special value for Solidarity Economy, for two reasons. First, Solidarity Economy projects emerge in contexts dominated by capitalist economic relations and are as much subject to demands for efficiency and productivity as any other economic project. Innovation is necessary for survival. Second, because while they compete with capitalist firms, at the same time it is the mission of Solidarity Economy projects to transform the basic economic relations, to shift the terms of competition itself from valorization of capital to cooperation and sustainable growth, or even “de-growth” (as in the fossil fuel industry). Solidarity Economy is an ambitious project of innovation in social-economic relations.

Finally, education and innovation are areas where inter-cooperation can be especially effective, with sharing of resources, cross-fertilization, and diffusion of techniques.

In an emerging Solidarity Economy one would expect to see internal education processes, study groups, training and educational workshops and classes, as well as cross-organizational educational projects. A high level of transparency, with use of the Internet for sharing information and encouraging participation in governance and management, would be other indicators of an educational practice, as would a high level of participation by stakeholders in the organization's activities and governing bodies. In terms of innovation, one would expect to see innovation and entrepreneurship programs that focus on transformation not just of products and processes but of basic social-economic relations, for example programs on cooperative entrepreneurship.

*Results:*

Due to considerations of length, the survey did not include a separate section on education, so the information gathered is limited. As mentioned above, education is a stated objective and means of many of the organizations. Seven organizations are dedicated to innovation and entrepreneurship, including co-working spaces, university-based programs, and business innovation projects. None of those organizations are dedicated to cooperative entrepreneurship, an increasingly important practice in countries like Finland, Spain, and South Korea.<sup>26</sup>

The numerous education, entrepreneurship, and innovation programs in El Paso County represent an area of potential development.

**B. Degree of Coherence with the Four Conceptual Themes**

**1. Centrality of Labor** – This is where the existing practice and strategy seems least coherent with the concept of Solidarity Economy. With a few notable exceptions, work and employment still appear to be organized along traditional lines. Sovereignty of Labor, the democratization of ownership and management, is the key to building a Solidarity Economy. Likewise, the creation of sustainable employment is essential for the development of communities organized around social needs. While most organizations have chosen the non-profit form, which implies subordinating profit to social goals, the choice of form seems to be treated as an organizational question, not a question of strategy for social transformation.

**2. Planetary Crisis** – Most organizations share this concern and have made it part of their work. Clearly, the recognition of the planetary context within which economic and social activity takes place has spread. The study did not show evidence that organizations in El Paso County feel the high urgency of climate change and associated ecological and social dynamics and the need for

---

<sup>26</sup> The leading example is the Mondragon Team Academy and its Leadership, Entrepreneurship and Innovation (LEINN) program. <http://mondragonteamacademy.com/mta/leinn>

radical transformation that has become characteristic of Solidarity Economy, the notion that we confront a choice between capitalism and life. However, this question needs further dialogue and investigation.

**3. Re-framing of the Economy and Society** – in this case, there seems to be a gap between practice and intent. There is activity underway in most spheres of Solidarity Economy, from agriculture to recycling, there are structures providing coordination and cooperation, and there are projects that explicitly re-politicize the economy, placing the question of the social purposes of economic activity front and center – most notably the various food security projects. However, the study did not find evidence of a conscious strategy to develop an alternative economy through inter-cooperation and links between spheres of activity. A shared process of development of a strategic vision – with plenty of room for variation and experimentation – would make this implicit practice explicit.

**4. Sector or Movement** – This is one of the key questions in defining a strategy of Solidarity Economy: is the goal to develop a new sector within the existing economic system or to build a movement for an alternative economic system? Because both strategies involve the creation of alternative business forms and the prioritization of social goals, the difference is not always clear. According to the conceptual framework of this study, Solidarity Economy is a social movement, not a single unified movement, but, as Ethan Miller says, a pluralistic “movement of movements.” (Miller 2010) Solidarity Economy requires an integration of social and political movements with alternative economic activity and it poses a challenge to the system as a whole. While the study did show some signs of integration, in the form of mutual support and shared participation in social movements, the instances of conscious integration and coordination – especially along the lines of “social impact” – reflect the predominance of the sectoral approach.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> Like many communities in the United States, El Paso County has seen an upsurge in social movement activism and the emergence of new activist organizations and coalitions in the wake of the election of Donald Trump. We can

## V. Conclusions and Next Steps

“Good survey... now PLEASE do something with it to make a difference.”

-- Respondent

Can we see Solidarity Economy in El Paso County? Is there a self-conscious and coordinated social-economic movement? - No. Is there a new “fourth sector” taking its seat at the economic table alongside the market, non-profit, and government sectors? - No. But across the key spheres of activity we can find the elements and outlines of an emerging alternative social-economic movement that is coherent with the coordinates and concepts of Solidarity Economy, “something” as Frank Waters writes, “without clear outline yet embodying the substance of a hope and meaning...” (Waters 1971, 1) It should become clearer and more substantial, if we move closer.

### A. Next Steps

For a bottom-up movement like Solidarity Economy, advice from outside based on one survey is of dubious value. The relevant and useful proposals will be those generated through a process of dialogue and reflection among the people doing the work. Nonetheless, it seems irresponsible to end without offering anything in the way of suggestions. So, in the spirit of stimulating discussion, I have prepared the following list of tentative recommendations.

#### **Solidarity Economy Working Group**

In order to carry out the type of projects described below, it would be useful to form some kind of working group of researchers and practitioners that could organize educational events and study circles to learn more about the theory and practice of Solidarity Economy. The working group could also cultivate groups for study and action based in local organizations and build links to Solidarity

---

assume that the patterns of participation have changed since the survey was conducted.

Economy networks and organizations in other cities. It would be essential to start such a group on a basis of inclusion and diversity, in accordance with the principle of equity. Among the main projects such a working group might undertake:

- Conduct a study project with members of various organizations;
- Carry out a bi-annual survey of Solidarity Economy;
- Create a map or interactive directory of Solidarity Economy in the county or state;
- Create a social audit – a tool organizations can use for documentation, self-evaluation and accountability.

The working group could encourage and support a range of other projects and activities. The following suggestions, grouped by coordinates, are offered as examples.

### **1. Equity**

- Carry out a “deep listening” study of the policies and practices of organizations in regards to equity and diversity.<sup>28</sup>
- Study the networks of peer-esteem, collaboration, and movement participation, in order to find missing links among organizations and communities.
- Study the history of cooperative and other Solidarity Economy practices in communities of color in the county.
- Create materials and organize events in multiple languages, to facilitate participation from non-English speaking communities.

### **2. Democracy and Transparency**

- Study the policies and practice of democratic governance in each organization.
- Provide access to information useful for participation in governance and management, such as financial statements, bylaws and rules, minutes of meetings, strategic plans, evaluations of the organization, etc.
- Develop structures and practices of cooperation, shared ownership, and self-management to facilitate the participation of workers, customers/users, and community members in the governance and management of organizations.

---

<sup>28</sup> See SolidarityNYC for an example of the deep listening approach.

- Study and spread best practices of transparency and democracy.

### **3. Sovereignty of Labor**

- Establish links to, and cultivate dialogue with unions and other labor organizations. Support labor struggles. For the labor organizations surveyed, the challenge is to reach out and build dialogue and joint work with the range of Solidarity Economy organizations.
- Prioritize the creation of jobs that are sustainable and secure, and reconsider the use of organizational and legal forms that encourage part-time or volunteer labor.
- Adopt policies on labor, labor rights, and labor organization in order to facilitate the democratization of work and the practice of labor sovereignty in solidarity organizations themselves as well as in society as a whole.
- Study worker cooperatives formed in Colorado and other states by labor unions and workers centers.
- Establish connections with organizations like the Union Cooperative Council of the U.S. Federation of Worker Cooperatives, the Sustainable Economies Law Center, Working World, and Democracy@Work.

### **4. Subordination of Capital**

- Maintain existing practices, limiting participation of outside investors and avoiding the creation of projects or companies with a capitalistic structure.
- Explore organizational forms that have been tried and abandoned, or not yet tried, such as community-based workers centers, local currencies, cooperative investment funds, and Transition Towns, to broaden the range of strategic options for communities.

### **5. Cooperation (and inter-cooperation)**

- Organize workshops and study groups on cooperativism and Solidarity Economy, including exchanges with existing Solidarity Economy projects.
- Explore the possibility of using cooperative forms when starting new projects, in order to increase employment opportunities and promote democratization of the economy.
- Develop systems for sharing financial and material resources among organizations.
- Research the role played by credit unions in El Paso County and explore possibilities for innovation in financing for cooperatives and other Solidarity Economy entities.<sup>29</sup>
- Explore possible forms of inter-cooperation such as the formation of industrial groups or regional groups and the creation of second-level organizations dedicated to the development

<sup>29</sup> There are many credit unions and a long history. Since 1958, IBEW 113 has had a small credit union, for example. <http://www.113creditunion.com/AU.html>

and consolidation of a Solidarity Economy ecosystem.

- Establish a working group to spread awareness of the various laws regarding cooperatives and other forms of worker-ownership.

## **6. Community (solidarity and development)**

- Taking into account their various missions, the communities in which they work, and the social movements in which they participate, identify the organizations that can serve as hubs, connecting the other organizations.
- Prioritize projects which generate equitable, democratic, and sustainable employment.
- Study the possibilities of participation in union apprenticeship programs, in order to generate employment and increase union membership.
- Develop programs specifically targeting youth, providing training and employment and supporting their growth as protagonists in Solidarity Economy projects and organizations.

## **7. Protection and Recuperation of the Planet**

- Study the positions of the various organizations in regards to the climate crisis and their strategic evaluation of the problem and its relation to the need for a new economic system.
- Create written policies on climate change with short and medium term objectives related to the practices of the organizations and their participation in social movements.

## **8. Social Transformation**

- Organize strategic planning workshops to encourage debate, dialogue and mutual education on the long term goals and visions of organizations.
- Do studies of social movement participation, looking for possible lines of development of Solidarity Economy as a “movement of movements.”
- Organize skills sharing and networking events among organizations that participate in the same social movements, perhaps with the assistance of the organizations in this study that play a “hub” role.
- Study the successes and failures of Solidarity Economy initiatives in order to better understand the strengths and weaknesses of the movement. Organize exchanges with organizations like Cooperation Jackson or the Mondragón Corporation.

## **9. Education (and innovation)**

- Organize internal education programs on cooperation and cooperative entrepreneurship to help regenerate and spread Solidarity Economy values and impede the resurgence of capitalist rationality within organizations.

- Study the practices of learning, innovation, and cooperative entrepreneurship developed in the LEINN (Leadership, Entrepreneurship, and Innovation) program at Mondragón University.
- Organize events with practitioners and researchers from universities, co-working spaces, and other centers of innovation and entrepreneurship to discuss possible connections to Solidarity Economy.
- Make a conscious effort to integrate education into the daily practices of organizations, including in governance and management, in order to cultivate and reinforce the skills and attitudes needed for democratic self-organization.

It remains to be seen whether the organizations described in this study, and others like them, will generate the strategic vision, the practices, and the organizational forms needed to start building a Solidarity Economy movement, or continue to work within the structures and imperatives of the dominant economy. There are projects across the country and in various countries that offer good examples for movement building, and perhaps practical support. The first step is gathering practitioners and researchers to discover the shared needs, aspirations, and strategies from which a common identity might emerge. I hope this study will contribute to such a process.

---

*Adapted from a Final Masters Project in Applied Social Economy and Cooperative Enterprise for the School of Business Administration, Mondragón University, Oñati, Euskadi, Spain. July, 2017. Research data is available on request. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons 4.0 Attribution-ShareAlike International License.*

### **Appendix 1 – The Survey (pdf)**

English: [https://drive.google.com/file/d/0ByGyqf\\_A0RxWT21ucm56VDVMQkk/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/0ByGyqf_A0RxWT21ucm56VDVMQkk/view?usp=sharing)

Español: [https://drive.google.com/file/d/0ByGyqf\\_A0RxWVknJdHVFMG9xaTg/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/0ByGyqf_A0RxWVknJdHVFMG9xaTg/view?usp=sharing)



## **Appendix 2 – Networks of Peer-Esteem, Collaborating Partners, and Social Movement Participation (interactive files)**

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1E2l0Yh3LAs9TctQvg6TixUKMuOEcxM65Qtx0mQ25>

[https://drive.google.com/open?id=1PQqTiDzIYyxib7tWHL\\_9m3Mh8Kf04OnoYLdVXVe2](https://drive.google.com/open?id=1PQqTiDzIYyxib7tWHL_9m3Mh8Kf04OnoYLdVXVe2)

[https://drive.google.com/open?id=1MvKJlItWLv34tNaxFbaL-OhRnWxd-msgRcf\\_ZOQn](https://drive.google.com/open?id=1MvKJlItWLv34tNaxFbaL-OhRnWxd-msgRcf_ZOQn)

## **Appendix 3 – Complete Responses (interactive file) and Directory of Responding Organizations (interactive file)**

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1f4I01tXz5F-VX3A8jZJOovbx5OKEgrGLAsT7gKNO>

Link to the complete file on Google Drive:

[https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/0ByGyqf\\_A0RxWdGo0M1JfbkVjRTA?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/0ByGyqf_A0RxWdGo0M1JfbkVjRTA?usp=sharing)

## **Bibliography** (See the bibliography in Part One of this article for additional sources.)

Adams, Tucker Hart. 2015. “Aging in the Pikes Peak Region, a Report from The Innovations in Aging Collaborative” Innovations in Aging Collaborative. <http://innovationsinaging.org>

Altuna Gabilondo, Larraitz (coord.). 2008. *La Experiencia Cooperativa de Mondragón, una Síntesis General*. Lanki-Huhezi. Eskoriatza, Euskadi.

Austin, Jennifer Jones. 2014. *Worker Cooperatives for New York City: A Vision for Addressing Income Inequality*. Federation of Protestant Welfare Agencies. New York.

Azkarraga, Joseba, Altuna, Larraitz, Kausel Teodoro y Iñurrategi, Iñigo. 2011. *La Evolución Sostenible (I): Una Crisis Multidimensional*. Cuadernos de Lanki (4). Lanki-Huhezi. Eskoriatza, Euskadi.

Azurmendi, Joxe. 1991. *El Hombre Cooperativo: Pensamiento de Arizmendiarieta*. Otalora.

Center for Nonprofit Excellence. 2016. *Pikes Peak Regional Nonprofit Directory*. <http://www.cnecoloradosprings.org/resources/nonprofit-directory/> Accessed 12/22/2016

Cheney, George. 1999. *Values at Work*. Cornell University Press. New York.

Christopolous, Dimitrios C. 2007. “Peer Esteem Snowballing: A Methodology for Expert Surveys.” Research Gate (Online).

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/255595189\\_Peer\\_Esteem\\_Snowballing\\_A\\_methodology\\_for\\_expert\\_surveys](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/255595189_Peer_Esteem_Snowballing_A_methodology_for_expert_surveys). Accessed May 2018

Comissió de balanç social de la Xarxa d’Economia Solidària. 2011. *L’economia solidària ensenya el cor: Informe agregat balanç social 2011*. El Balanç Social de la Xarxa d’Economia Solidària.

Defourny, Jacques, Hulgard, L., and Pestoff, V. 2014. “Introduction to the SE Field”. *Social Enterprise and the Third Sector. Changing European Landscapes in a Comparative Perspective*. Routledge.

Gibson-Graham, J.K., Cameron, Jenny, and Healy, Stephen. 2013. *Take Back the Economy: An Ethical Guide for Transforming Our Communities*. University of Minnesota Press.

Guerra, Pablo. 2006. “La economía de la solidaridad. O la vuelta de los valores sociales a la economía.”

Revista Umbrales, No. 168. Montevideo, Uruguay.

IARSE. 2008. Indicadores de Responsabilidad Social Empresaria para PyMES. Instituto Argentino de Responsabilidad Social Empresaria (IARSE), Córdoba – Argentina.

Kania, John, and Kramer, Mark. 2011. Collective Impact. Stanford Social Innovation Review. Winter 2011. [https://ssir.org/articles/entry/collective\\_impact](https://ssir.org/articles/entry/collective_impact) Accessed 6/2017

Klein, Naomi. 2015. This Changes Everything: Capitalism vs. the Climate. Penguin Books.

Laville, Jean-Louis. 2011. What is the third sector? From the non-profit sector to the social and solidarity economy: theoretical debate and european reality. EMES Working Papers Series No. 11/01.

Lewis, Mike y Swinney, Dan. 2007. “Social Economy? Solidarity Economy? Exploring the Implications of Conceptual Nuance for Acting in a Volatile World.” BALTA Working Paper Series. Canadian Centre for Community Renewal.

Miller, Ethan. 2010. “Solidarity Economy: Key Concepts and Issues”. Published in Kawano, Emily and Tom Masterson and Jonathan Teller-Ellsberg (eds). Solidarity Economy I: Building Alternatives for People and Planet. Amherst, MA: Center for Popular Economics.

Monzón Campos, José Luis, Maruri, Isidro Antuñano, Serrano, Francisco Marco. 2010. Sectores de la nueva economía 20+20: La economía social. Fundación EOI. Madrid. España.

Moulaert, Frank y Ailenei, Oana. 2005. “Social Economy, Third Sector and Solidarity Relations: A Conceptual Synthesis from History to Present”. Urban Studies Journal 2005; 42; 2037.

Mullin and Lonergan Associates. 2014. “Housing Needs Assessment” City of Colorado Springs Housing Needs Assessment October 2014. <http://mandl.net/projects/colorado-springs-hna/> Accessed 12/2016

Napierkowski, Harriet. 2016. Looking to Our Future – *Pikes Peak Region 2030*: 2016 Pikes Peak Regional Sustainability Report. Peak Alliance for a Sustainable Future. Colorado Springs, Colorado.

Noyes, Matt. 2017. We'll See It When We Know It: Recognizing Emergent Solidarity Economy. Grassroots Economic Organizing (GEO), <http://geo.coop/story/well-see-it-when-we-know-it> Accessed May 4, 2018

Pearce, John. 2003. Social Enterprise in Any Town, published by the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, UK. [www.centralbooks.co.uk](http://www.centralbooks.co.uk)

Razeto Migliaro, Luis. 1993. “Centralidad del trabajo y economía de solidaridad.” El Corazón del Arco Iris, Jorge Osorio y Luis Weinstein editores, CEAAL, Santiago de Chile.

REAS Euskadi. 2011a. Bateria de indicadores para Auditoria Social de Economía Solidaria. Manual práctico de utilización de la herramienta. Bilbao, Euskadi.

RIPESS. 2008. Charter of Principles and Mission. <https://ripessna.wordpress.com/ripess-charter-and-mission/ripess-charter-of-principles-and-mission/> Accessed 12/22/2016

Schlosser, Eric. 2005. Fast Food Nation, The Dark Side of the All-American Meal. Harper Perennial. New York, USA

Sitrin, Marina. 2006. Horizontalism: Voices of Popular Power in Argentina. AK Press. Chico, California, USA

SolidarityNYC, 2013. Growing a Resilient City, Possibilities for Collaboration in New York City's Solidarity Economy, a Report by SolidarityNYC. <http://solidaritynyc.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/Growing-A-Resilient-City-SolidarityNYC-Report.pdf> Accessed 12/2016

Sustainable Economies Law Center. 2015. Think Outside the Boss: How to Create a Worker-Owned

Business. 7Th Edition. Sustainable Economies Law Center. California.

Uriarte Zabala, Leire; Pagalday Tricio, Enertiz; y Zufiarre Astigarraga, Miren. 2012 Cuadernos de Lanki (7). Eskoriatza.

Waters, Frank. 1971, Pikes Peak, a Mining Saga. Swallow Press/Ohio University Press. Athens, Ohio, USA.

## **Projects and Tools**

Cooperation Jackson – <http://www.cooperationjackson.org/>

Data Commons Cooperative – <http://datacommons.coop/>

FindCoop directory of alternative economic initiatives – <http://find.coop/>

Front Range Economic Strategy Center – <http://www.fresc.org/>

Mapa de Soluciones de la Economía Solidaria y Social – [http://www.socioeco.org/solutions\\_es.html](http://www.socioeco.org/solutions_es.html)

Mapping the Solidarity Economy – <https://mappingthesolidarityeconomy.wordpress.com/>

Open Street Map – <http://www.openstreetmap.org>

REAS Portal de Economía Solidaria – <http://www.economiasolidaria.org/>

RIPES North America. <https://ripessna.wordpress.com/>

Social Enterprise Alliance – <https://socialenterprise.us/community/organization-directory/>

Solidarity Economy Map and Directory – <http://solidarityeconomy.us/>

Solidarity Economy Resources – <http://cborowiak.haverford.edu/solidarityeconomy/mapping-initiatives/philadelphia-mapping-project/>

Solidarity NYC – <http://solidaritynyc.org>

Solidarity St. Louis (<http://www.solidaritystl.org/map>)

Sustainable Economies Law Center (SEL) <http://www.theselc.org/>

Xarxa d'Economía Solidària – <http://www.xes.cat>