

# Your Internet Bill, Your Grocery Bill, and the Machine Behind Both

*Build protections against extractive systems—so the next generation doesn't have to live under them.*

By Vincent Cordova - March 18, 2026



After **Verizon** bought **Frontier**, my internet bill went up again. No warning. No explanation. **Just deal with.**

But that wasn't the first time.

We **paid off** all our corporate phones in a **One Talk Solution**. Signed up with terms we understood. Then the price went up anyway.

My personal devices: one phone, one smart watch, one second number. Over \$100 a month. For devices I already own.

Most people get over it. Most of the time, I do too. *It's just how things work now, huh?*

But here's what I finally realized: it's not separate problems. It's the same problem, showing up in different places. I should expect that in an extractive system, correct?

**Why and how come? - Only if wages matched that.**

Internet goes up. Phones go up. The terms you agreed to change. The devices you own keep costing you. And every time, the explanation is the same—which is to say, there isn't one.

That's not a coincidence. ***That's a system.***

Thanks, **Verizon**, for taking the value out of working hard. I wonder how many children will eat less because of it, especially knowing wages barely meet the cost of life already.

I expect more from you. You're our "one solution" now, and I'd like to keep it that way. But you know what happens if I move on? I get the same "consolidated power," controlling my "competitive" prices from another value extractor company.

**Is it a lose-lose situation?**

**Please be or do better because I don't want to change providers.**

**A machine.**

***They say that they are not run by conspirators meeting in secret room.*** Run by incentives so perfectly aligned that the outcomes look coordinated even when no one's coordinating. Run by ownership so concentrated that competition becomes a memory. Run by a system designed to extract from the builders, not to build. ***How was slavery coordinated?*** (See Part 17: *How Slavery Was Coordinated*)

Three firms sit at the center of this machine: **Vanguard, BlackRock, and State Street**. Together, they are the largest shareholders in 88% of all S&P 500 companies [Harvard's John Coates]. They own roughly 20% of both Verizon and AT&T—your two strong "choices" for internet service [SEC filings]. They vote 91% of the time in shareholder elections. Individual investors like you? We vote 28% [Harvard Law School Forum].

***They don't set prices, they say.*** They don't manage operations. They don't need to. When you own 20% of every option, when you vote 91% of the time, when every CEO knows what you expect—the machine runs itself.

In markets with no real competition—internet service, food production, raw materials—that machine produces one outcome consistently: **prices rise, across every sector, at the same time.**

If you run a small business, you've felt this. Internet goes up. Supplies go up. Logistics go up. Your competitor down the street gets the same increases on the same day. It doesn't feel like competition. It feels like structure.

That's because it is.

---

## The Machine Runs on Raw Materials

This pattern doesn't stop at your internet bill. It runs through everything.

On February 18, 2026, President Trump signed an executive order declaring **elemental phosphorus and glyphosate-based herbicides** critical to U.S. national security [White House]. The order invoked the Defense Production Act of 1950, a law designed to mobilize American industry for war.

Why? Because elemental phosphorus is in your food (fertilizer), your phone (semiconductors), your car's battery, and your military's smoke screens and incendiary devices. China controls 84% of global production. The U.S. controls 5% [[essentialchemicalindustry.com](https://essentialchemicalindustry.com)]. We import over 6 million kilograms annually.

Glyphosate is the world's most widely used herbicide. Without it, a family of four would pay 48% more for groceries. Crop yields would drop 50-90% for fruits and vegetables. Farmers would need an additional 800 million acres to maintain current production—an area equivalent to 42% of the lower 48 states [Bayer].

The order states plainly: any interruption of supply "could leave our defense industrial base and food supply vulnerable to hostile foreign actors."

But here's what the order doesn't say. The same machine that owns your internet provider also owns the companies that mine phosphorus, manufacture glyphosate, and distribute food. Vanguard, BlackRock, and State Street are among the largest shareholders in every link of that chain.

The threat isn't just foreign. It's structural. When ownership concentrates, prices rise. When prices rise everywhere, it's not a market—it's a toll road.

---

## Two Visions of Security

Not everyone accepts this.

Will Harris, a regenerative farmer at White Oak Pastures in Georgia, issued a statement opposing the executive order. He wrote:

"We firmly believe moving away from these inputs in mass is not optional—it's necessary, and it's beyond time... We believe a more appropriate executive order would have declared the PROTECTION of our soils, water, and rural communities to be national security issues" [White Oak Pastures].

Harris points to the long-term damage from chemical drift, contaminated land, and poisoned waterways. He argues that true security lies in healthy soil and clean water, not in guaranteeing supply for extractive industries.

He's right. But here's the problem: even regenerative farmers need to buy supplies. Even organic farms need inputs. And those inputs come from companies owned by the same machine.

The question isn't whether we use these substances—it's **who controls them and what they're incentivized to do with that control.**

When private equity and extractive capital control critical materials, their incentives are:

- Minimize costs (including safety)
- Maximize price
- Fight transparency
- Externalize harm

When mission-locked enterprises control them, their incentives are:

- Protect workers (who are owners)
- Serve the public (locked mission)
- Be transparent (public trust)
- Invest in safer alternatives (long-term horizon)

The harm is not in the substance. It's in who controls it and what they're allowed to do with that control.

---

## **The Structures Already Exist**

Here's what surprised me most. The alternative models already exist. They're just not visible.

**Perpetual Purpose Trusts** hold businesses in perpetuity to fulfill a specific mission. Patagonia transferred ownership to a Perpetual Purpose Trust in 2022. All voting stock went into the trust, created to protect the company's mission and values. The remaining non-voting stock went to a nonprofit that receives Patagonia's profits to fight climate change. The company continues operating as a for-profit B Corp, but now all profits serve the planet [Patagonia].

The Guardian has been owned by the Scott Trust since 1936. The trust exists for one reason: "to secure the financial and editorial independence of The Guardian in perpetuity." It has no shareholders. It cannot be bought [Scott Trust].

**Employee Ownership Trusts** benefit employees by holding shares on their behalf. Research shows employee-owned firms have 50% lower bankruptcy rates and over 90% higher employee net wealth [NCEO].

Mainscape, a commercial landscape company with 950 employees across 11 states, is transitioning into the Mainscape Jubilee Trust—a perpetual purpose trust created to protect the company's purpose, invest in its people, and ensure shared prosperity for generations. Founder Dave Mazanowski acknowledges he's leaving money on the table by not selling to private equity. "This is my way of testing whether I believe any of that is true," he says. "Am I going to really make a decision that reflects my beliefs?" [Mainscape].

These models exist. They work. They just need visibility and scale.

---

### **What We're Building: The Registry of Un-Acquirable Enterprises**

Right now, there's no way to find these businesses. No directory. No certification. No way for a consumer to know, at a glance, which enterprises are legally locked and which are designed to be sold.

That absence matters. What people can't see, they can't support.

We're building a **Registry of Un-Acquirable Enterprises**—a public, verifiable directory of businesses legally incapable of being sold to extractive capital. Certified. Searchable. Free.

The registry will include:

- Perpetual purpose trusts
- Worker-owned cooperatives
- Steward-owned enterprises
- Employee ownership trusts
- Nonprofit industrial operators

For consumers: a way to choose businesses that can never be sold.

For founders: a roadmap for building differently.

For policymakers: a tool for supporting structural diversity.

For investors: a signal that these enterprises exist and need capital.

---

## How We Build It

The tools already exist. Open-source, government-grade platforms are available today.

**OpenG2P** is an open-source platform enabling governments to build secure, inclusive registries for social benefit delivery. It's a Digital Public Good recognized by the Digital Public Goods Alliance, designed for creating functional registries of individuals, non-human entities, and groups. The platform handles change management, audit trails, and interoperability—everything a registry needs [OpenG2P].

Similar platforms include:

- **Diia.Engine:** Built by Ukraine for state registries; used by an actual national government
- **Sovrium:** Self-hosted; "Own your data. Own your tools. Own your future."
- **NocoBase:** Enterprise-grade with plugin architecture for starting simple and growing
- **Liquio:** Built for public sector digital transformation
- **Jet Admin:** AI-powered for rapid prototyping

We can have a working registry in weeks. For free. On infrastructure we own. With data we control.

The registry itself must be un-acquirable. That means legal structures—perpetual purpose trust, steward-ownership, or similar—that lock the mission forever, prevent any sale or transfer of control, and ensure the registry serves the public in perpetuity.

---

## Partnering With Global Leaders: The Conversion Strategy

The machine controls production today. But production doesn't have to stay in extractive hands.

We can partner with global chemical manufacturers to transition their operations—or parts of them—into mission-locked structures. This isn't about nationalization or seizure. It's about **conversion**.

### Global Partners Already Doing This Work

**FBC Chemical (Pennsylvania, USA)** — In late 2023, this third-generation family chemical company transitioned to 100% employee ownership through an ESOP. The six Hudac brothers, ranging from 60 to 75 years old, chose employee ownership over selling to private equity. "We believe that can often ruin a culture and a lot of folks can end up losing jobs," said Owen Hudac,

third-generation family employee. "A huge focus was protecting our employees and our culture." FBC Chemical now has 80 employees across Pennsylvania, New York, and Ohio, with six warehouses. As a 100% ESOP, all profits are tax-free at the federal and state level—"There is nothing else in the tax code like it," says Kevin McPhillips of the Pennsylvania Center for Employee Ownership. Wages for employees age 24-35 are 33% higher in employee-owned companies, and they're 8-12% more productive than non-employee-owned businesses .

**Harcros Chemicals (Kansas, USA)** — This chemical manufacturing company has been employee-owned since 2013. While not formally certified, third-party data confirms their ESOP meets standards for significant and broad-based employee ownership. They represent a proven model of a chemical manufacturer operating under mission-locked structure for over a decade .

**Latro Kimya (Istanbul, Turkey)** — Founded in 2010 as a textile chemical supplier, Latro has transformed into what it calls a "living ecosystem" of self-managing teams. Operating in over 30 countries across cosmetics, agriculture, electronics, and aerospace, Latro removed all hierarchical layers in 2020 and replaced them with autonomous "hubs." Each hub handles its own operations, hiring, and financial performance. Since 2021, 10-20% of quarterly net profits are shared equally across all employees. Founder Haluk Can Hür stepped down as CEO in 2021, reinforcing true decentralization. In 2024, Latro was recognized as one of Europe's best workplaces .

**Why Manufacturers Might Partner**

Reason	Explanation
<b>Regulatory pressure</b>	Governments are watching concentration. Proactive conversion builds goodwill.
<b>ESG credibility</b>	Real structural change beats greenwashing. A mission-locked subsidiary is permanent proof.
<b>Talent retention</b>	Young workers want meaning. Companies with locked missions attract better people.
<b>Succession planning</b>	Founders and family owners need exit options besides selling to private equity.
<b>Risk management</b>	Extractively owned assets face backlash. Mission-locked assets build community support.
<b>Supply chain security</b>	Buyers increasingly want assurance that suppliers won't be disrupted by acquisitions.

## The Model: Hybrid Structures

A global chemical manufacturer could:

- Spin off a division into a separate entity
- Structure that entity as a perpetual purpose trust or steward-owned enterprise
- Retain a minority economic interest (profit share) while ceding control
- License technology to the new entity at fair rates
- Become a preferred supplier to the un-acquirable ecosystem

The manufacturer gets:

- A credible demonstration of commitment to safety and sustainability
- A controlled transition that doesn't disrupt core business
- A seat at the table in the emerging mission-locked economy

The public gets:

- Critical materials produced by entities that can never be sold to extractive capital
- Transparent governance and safety incentives
- A model that can be replicated across sectors

---

## Global Coalitions Already Forming

**The Global Impact Coalition (GIC)** is a CEO-led platform driving the chemical value chain toward a circular, net-zero future. Incubated at the World Economic Forum, GIC turns sustainability challenges into commercial solutions through cross-industry collaboration. Members include **BASF, SABIC, Clariant, Covestro, LG Chem, LyondellBasell, Mitsubishi Chemical Group, Moeve, Syensqo, and SUEZ** .

In December 2025, **Henkel Adhesive Technologies** joined GIC, extending its reach downstream by connecting raw-material innovation with industrial market expertise. GIC CEO Charlie Tan stated: "At a time when the industry is redefining itself under the weight of climate commitments and cost pressure, collaboration is the only credible path forward" .

This is exactly the kind of coalition that could support mission-locked conversion at scale.

**Syensqo and Sinopec** signed a Strategic Partnership Framework Agreement in April 2025 to co-develop sustainable materials for aerospace, transportation, energy, and electronics. The partnership focuses on circular chemicals and carbon footprint reduction. Dr. Ilham Kadri, CEO of Syensqo, stated: "This partnership perfectly aligns with our goal to pursue breakthroughs that advance humanity. Together, we will develop innovative solutions that address the needs of modern industries while lowering environmental impact" .

**Bayer** has implemented "Dynamic Shared Ownership" (DSO) since 2023, a model that invites teams to step into shared responsibility, flatten hierarchies, and move faster. Daniel Schneiders, Bayer's Climate Program Director, led a DSO team that built a new decarbonization pathway in six months—a process that would have taken over a year under traditional structures. "With DSO, we get the right people in the room. We define the goal, and we get to work. You don't wait for permission. You create progress" .

---

### **The Defense Production Act Precedent**

On February 19, 2026, the Defense Department announced an \$11.8 million Defense Production Act award to Umicore Optical Materials to establish new processing capability in Oklahoma, aiming to shore up domestic supply of materials for advanced optical and infrared systems [Defense Department].

Section 303 of the Defense Production Act authorizes the President to make provision for "purchases of or commitments to purchase an industrial resource or a critical technology item" and "the development of production capabilities." It also explicitly authorizes "the development of substitutes for strategic and critical materials, critical components, critical technology items, and other industrial resources" [50 U.S.C. § 4533].

The precedent exists. The legal authority exists. The question is whether we use it to incubate mission-locked enterprises alongside extractive ones.

---

### **Why This Becomes a Global Project**

This isn't just about internet bills. It's about building infrastructure for a different kind of economy—one where enterprises can be structured to endure, not to be extracted from.

Once the registry exists, it can spread:

- A founder in Brazil can see how to structure a purpose trust
- A worker in Kenya can find cooperatives to join

- A consumer in Germany can choose un-acquirable products
- A policymaker in Canada can support mission-locked enterprises
- An investor anywhere can allocate capital to businesses that can never be sold

The machine is global. The response must be too.

Every country facing concentrated ownership, rising costs, and extractive capital needs this tool. Every community trying to build something lasting needs a way to be seen.

The registry becomes a map. The map becomes a movement. The movement becomes a global infrastructure for enterprises built to last.

---

### **The Ask**

I don't have money to pay anyone. The machine has trillions. It has decades of momentum. It has lawyers and lobbyists and a system built to extract.

What I have is a phone number. A problem that needs solving. And an invitation.

**If you're an attorney who can structure the registry itself to be un-acquirable—not for a fee, but for a legacy—call me: 350-229-1046.**

When you call, say: "I don't need money. Tell me about the problem."

No spam. No debate. Just builders.

**If you're a chemical manufacturer facing the choice between selling to private equity or locking your mission forever—call me.**

**If you're with a company like FBC Chemical, Harcros, Latro, or any of the Global Impact Coalition members—call me. Let's talk about what conversion could look like.**

**If you're a founder:** Ask a different question while you build: not just "how do I grow?" but "how do I structure this so it can never be taken?"

**If you know an un-acquirable business:** Add it to the public spreadsheet. Link in bio. Visibility is leverage.

**If you're none of those things:** Share this post. One person. That's all it takes.

---

### **The Closing**

I started with an internet bill. I found a machine.

The machine has trillions. It has a 50-year head start. It has every incentive to keep extracting.

But it doesn't have meaning. It can't offer a lawyer the chance to build something that outlasts them. It can't offer a developer the chance to code the infrastructure for a new economy. It can't offer a founder the chance to lock their life's work forever.

That's what we're offering.

There are so many intelligent people out there. I know you're reading this. I know you've been waiting for something that matters.

This is it.

My internet bill went up. If we build this—really build it, lock it forever, make it global—our kids won't have to accept that as normal.

They'll have something better.

And that's worth building.

---

**Vincent Cordova** is going to “attempt” to build the Registry of Un-Acquirable Enterprises. If you are a developer, please build it- this can change the world, let's do it together. :)

**For attorneys, founders, and chemical manufacturers: 350-229-1046**

**#UnAcquirableRegistry #BreakTheMachine #ProtectTheNextGeneration #ConvertDontSell**

## REFERENCES

### Part 1: Ownership Concentration & The "Big Three"

1. **The 88% Statistic:** Fichtner, J., Heemskerk, E. M., & Garcia-Bernardo, J. (2017). "Hidden power of the Big Three? Passive index funds, re-concentration of corporate ownership, and new financial risk." *Business and Politics*. Cited in: "They Already Own 89% Of The S&P 500, And Now They Are Coming After Single-Family Homes In America' Warns RFK Jr." *Yahoo Finance*, July 2, 2024.

2. **Vanguard, BlackRock, State Street as largest shareholders:** SEC Form 13F filings; Fichtner et al. (2017). The three firms are the largest shareholders in 88% of S&P 500 companies and 40% of all U.S. listed corporations.
  3. **Verizon and AT&T ownership:** SEC Form 13F filings. Vanguard and BlackRock are consistently among the top two shareholders of both companies, with combined ownership typically exceeding 20%.
  4. **Institutional vs. retail voting rates:** Gramitto Ricci, S. A. (2025). "The Shareholder Democracy Lie: Why We Need to Stop Pretending Corporate America Is Democratic." *European Corporate Governance Institute (ECGI) Blog*, July 16, 2025. Institutional investors hold approximately 70% of all U.S. equity and vote at disproportionately higher rates than retail investors.
  5. **"De-retailization" of share ownership:** Gramitto Ricci, S. A. (2025). Since the 1980s, individual investors have been systematically displaced by institutional behemoths.
  6. **Proxy advisory influence:** Gramitto Ricci, S. A. (2025). Firms like ISS and Glass Lewis wield enormous influence over corporate elections, creating another layer of intermediation between actual people and corporate decision-making.
  7. **History of "shareholder democracy" rhetoric:** Ott, J. (2011). *When Wall Street Met Main Street: The Quest for an Investors' Democracy*. Harvard University Press. Cited in: Gramitto Ricci (2025). The term was crafted in the 1920s as marketing to attract everyday investors and later weaponized to fight government regulation.
- 

## Part 2: Executive Order on Phosphorus and Glyphosate

8. **February 18, 2026 Executive Order:** The White House. "Fact Sheet: President Donald J. Trump Ensures an Adequate Supply of Elemental Phosphorus and Glyphosate-Based Herbicides for National Security." February 17, 2026.
9. **Defense Production Act invocation:** The White House (2026). The order delegates authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to require contract performance and allocate materials, services, and facilities to ensure continued supply.
10. **National security finding:** The White House (2026). "Any interruption of supply of either of these critical materials could leave our defense industrial base and food supply vulnerable to hostile foreign actors."

11. **Uses of elemental phosphorus:** The White House (2026). Crucial for smoke, illumination, and incendiary devices; semiconductors in radar, solar cells, sensors, and optoelectronics; lithium-ion battery chemistries used in weapon systems.
  12. **Single domestic producer:** The White House (2026). Only one domestic producer of elemental phosphorus and glyphosate-based herbicides exists, and U.S. needs far exceed current output.
  13. **Previous DPA actions:** The White House (2026). March 2025: Executive Order to expand domestic mineral production capacity. April 2025: Executive Order to revitalize maritime industry. May 2025: DPA invoked for spent nuclear fuel management.
  14. **February 19, 2026 DPA award:** U.S. Department of Defense. "Defense Production Act Title III Program Award to Umicore Optical Materials." February 19, 2026. \$11.8 million award to establish new processing capability in Oklahoma for advanced optical and infrared systems.
  15. **DPA Section 303 authority:** 50 U.S.C. § 4533. Authorizes the President to make provision for "purchases of or commitments to purchase an industrial resource or a critical technology item," "the development of production capabilities," and "the development of substitutes for strategic and critical materials."
- 

### Part 3: Phosphorus Production and Supply

16. **Global phosphorus production capacity:** "Phosphorus: Essential Chemical and Food Production." [essentialchemicalindustry.com](https://essentialchemicalindustry.com). China controls approximately 84% of global elemental phosphorus production capacity. Kazakhstan controls 6%. United States controls 5%. Western Europe controls 5%.
  17. **U.S. import data:** U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). "Mineral Commodity Summaries: Phosphorus." Annual reports. The U.S. imports over 6 million kilograms of elemental phosphorus annually.
  18. **Phosphorus production energy requirements:** [essentialchemicalindustry.com](https://essentialchemicalindustry.com). Each tonne requires approximately 14 MWh of energy, limiting production to regions with cheap electricity.
- 

### Part 4: Glyphosate Economic Impact

19. **Crop losses without protection:** Bayer Crop Science. "Glyphosate and Global Food Security." 26-40% of world's potential crops lost annually to weeds, pests, and diseases.
  20. **Grocery cost impact:** Bayer Crop Science. A family of four would pay 48% more for groceries without glyphosate.
  21. **Fruit/vegetable price increase:** Bayer Crop Science. 35-45% on top of existing inflation.
  22. **Yield drop without glyphosate:** Bayer Crop Science. 50-90% for fruits and vegetables.
  23. **Additional land needed:** Bayer Crop Science. Equivalent to 800 million acres—42% of the land area of the lower 48 states.
  24. **Fossil fuel reduction from no-till farming:** Bayer Crop Science. 558 million gallons per year saved.
  25. **Jobs and wages:** Bayer Crop Science. Over 1 million American jobs supported; over \$33 billion in wages generated.
  26. **Cost of alternatives:** Bayer Crop Science. 2 to 2.5 times more expensive per acre.
- 

## Part 5: Toxicity Data

27. **Yellow/white phosphorus acute toxicity:** National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI). "Phosphorus, Yellow." PubChem Compound Database. Less than 1 mg/kg can cause symptoms; more than 1 mg/kg can be fatal. Historical mortality rates: 48-50% in those who ingest large doses. Minimum danger: 15 mg can cause symptoms; 60 mg can be fatal.
28. **Phosphorus health effects:** Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR). "Toxicological Profile for White Phosphorus." Damages liver, kidneys, heart, spleen, central nervous system. Symptoms: eye/respiratory irritation, skin burns, abdominal pain, nausea, jaundice, anemia, dental pain, jaw swelling. Burns can be fatal "even when a relatively small area of the body is affected."
29. **Phosphorus aquatic toxicity:** Environment Canada (1981). "Environmental and Technical Information for Problem Spills: White Phosphorus." Toxic to aquatic animals and plants at "trace concentrations."
30. **Yellow vs. red phosphorus distinction:** NCBI. Yellow/white phosphorus: highly toxic, luminous, waxy, oxidizes in air. Red phosphorus: non-toxic, amorphous, non-volatile, non-absorbable.

31. **EPA glyphosate classification:** U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2017, 2020). Classified glyphosate as "not likely" to pose cancer risk; "poses no risks to public health" when used according to label.
  32. **IARC glyphosate classification:** International Agency for Research on Cancer (2015). *IARC Monographs Volume 112: Glyphosate*. Classified as "probably carcinogenic to humans" (Group 2A); "limited evidence" in humans for carcinogenicity; "sufficient evidence" in experimental animals.
  33. **2023 genotoxicity study:** Environmental Health (2023). 33 tests of technical glyphosate—73% reported positive genotoxic results. 61 tests of glyphosate-based herbicides—95% reported positive results. 7 of 7 in vivo human studies reported positive results. Conclusion: "the conclusion that GBHs pose no risk of cancer via a genotoxic mechanism is untenable."
  34. **2025 comprehensive review:** *Science of the Total Environment* (2025). Glyphosate residues are now "ubiquitous" in the environment; frequent contaminant in drinking water and food chains; associated with carcinogenicity, metabolic syndrome, reproductive effects, endocrine disruption.
  35. **2026 aquatic toxicity meta-analysis:** *Aquatic Toxicology* (2026). Commercial formulations are "consistently significantly more toxic than glyphosate alone" — attributed to surfactant co-formulants. Primary mechanisms: oxidative stress, enzymatic inhibition, endocrine disruption. Sensitivity hierarchy: aquatic plants > fish > invertebrates > amphibians.
  36. **Co-formulant toxicity:** 2026 meta-analysis. "Inert" ingredients "clearly contribute to GLY-induced hazards and risk gradients."
- 

## Part 6: Alternative Structures—Perpetual Purpose Trusts

37. **Patagonia transfer:** Patagonia, Inc. "Patagonia's Next Chapter: Earth Is Now Our Only Shareholder." September 14, 2022. Yvon Chouinard transferred 98% of shares (voting and non-voting) to the Holdfast Collective, a climate-focused nonprofit. The remaining 2% of voting shares went to the Patagonia Purpose Trust.
38. **Patagonia legal structure analysis:** Transformative Private Law. "The Transfer of Ownership in the 'Patagonia Case': Tax Avoidance or a Step toward a Non-Extractive Economy?" January 11, 2023. Analyzes the steward-ownership structure, tax implications, and governance questions.

39. **Patagonia tax status:** Transformative Private Law (2023). The Holdfast Collective is structured as a 501(c)(4) "social welfare organization," which allows political engagement but does not make donations tax-deductible. The transfer of non-voting shares was tax-free.
  40. **The Scott Trust:** The Scott Trust. "The Scott Trust: Guardian of the Guardian." Established 1936 to "secure the financial and editorial independence of The Guardian in perpetuity." The trust has no shareholders and cannot be bought.
  41. **Mainscape perpetual purpose trust:** Mainscape, Inc. "Mainscape Announces Transition to Perpetual Purpose Trust." 2024. The Mainscape Jubilee Trust was created to protect company purpose, invest in employees, and ensure shared prosperity for generations. Founder Dave Mazanowski: "This is my way of testing whether I believe any of that is true. Am I going to really make a decision that reflects my beliefs?"
- 

## Part 7: Employee Ownership Trusts (ESOPs)

42. **ESOP definition and characteristics:** Truist. "Understanding employee stock ownership plans (ESOPs)." December 18, 2025. Shares held in trust for employees; company remains privately held; value assessed annually.
43. **ESOP statistics:** National Center for Employee Ownership (NCEO), based on Department of Labor data. 6,574 ESOPs in the United States as of 2023; 14.96 million participants.
44. **Performance data:** NCEO. Employee-owned firms have 50% lower bankruptcy rates; over 90% higher employee net wealth; 8-12% more productive than non-employee-owned businesses.
45. **Wage benefits:** Pennsylvania Center for Employee Ownership. Wages for employees age 24-35 are 33% higher in employee-owned companies.
46. **Tax benefits:** Pennsylvania Center for Employee Ownership. Profits in 100% ESOP-owned companies are tax-free at federal and state level. "There is nothing else in the tax code like it."
47. **FBC Chemical transition:** Butler Eagle. "Mars chemical company transitions to full employee ownership." March 27, 2024. Third-generation family chemical company transitioned to 100% ESOP in late 2023. Six Hudac brothers (ages 60-75) chose employee ownership over selling to private equity. "We believe that can often ruin a culture and a lot of folks can end up losing jobs. A huge focus was protecting our employees and our

culture." Company now has 80 employees across Pennsylvania, New York, and Ohio, with six warehouses.

48. **Harcros Chemicals:** Certified EO. "Harcros Chemicals." Employee-owned since 2013. Chemical manufacturer with ESOP meeting standards for significant and broad-based employee ownership.
  49. **Owl's Head Alloys:** Truist (2025). Scrap metal business in Bowling Green, Kentucky, became 100% employee-owned in 2019. CFO Travis Jones: "We're trying to enable people to build wealth that they might not otherwise have had the opportunity to build. We want them to not only have a job but to create a nest egg they can tap into in the future."
  50. **Setup costs:** Truist (2025). ESOP setup expenses often exceed \$100,000.
  51. **Other employee-owned examples:** Butler Eagle (2024). Sheetz, Wawa, Publix, and Jasper are partially or fully employee-owned.
- 

## Part 8: Steward-Ownership and Self-Management Models

52. **Latro Kimya:** Corporate Rebels. "Latro: Building an Ecosystem of Ownership in the Turkish Chemical Industry." August 31, 2025. Founded 2010 in Istanbul; operates in over 30 countries across cosmetics, agriculture, electronics, aerospace. Removed hierarchical layers in 2020, replaced with autonomous "hubs." Each hub handles own operations, hiring, financial performance.
53. **Latro profit sharing:** Corporate Rebels (2025). Since 2021, 10-20% of quarterly net profits shared equally across all employees. Compensation based on experience and education, positioned 10-20% above industry averages. No performance bonuses.
54. **Latro founder transition:** Corporate Rebels (2025). Founder Haluk Can Hür stepped down as CEO in 2021 to reinforce decentralization and remove perceived dependencies. Continues as mentor without final authority.
55. **Latro recognition:** Corporate Rebels (2025). Recognized in 2024 as one of Europe's best workplaces by Great Place to Work Institute and Modern Work Award.
56. **Latro recruitment process:** Corporate Rebels (2025). Introduced "dating approach" in 2023: mutual exploration meeting, paid trial days, two-month trial period without contract before formal offer. Improved cultural fit and reduced early departures.

57. **Steward-ownership movement:** Transformative Private Law (2023). Patagonia's structure is an example of "steward ownership"—splitting profit rights from control rights to ensure mission permanence.
- 

## Part 9: Safer Alternatives—Glyphosate

58. **Inorganic salt herbicide:** Yissum (Hebrew University technology transfer company). Patent WO 2020/225804. Kills plants by changing ion balance and dehydrating them—different mechanism from glyphosate. Effective on glyphosate-resistant plants. Environmentally friendly. Compatible with existing equipment. TRL6—demonstrated in relevant environment.
59. **Icafolin-methyl:** Bayer Crop Science. First new chemical class of herbicide in 30 years. Non-selective; strong results against glyphosate-resistant ryegrass. Very low application rates. Applications submitted to EU, US, Canada, Brazil; Australian application planned 2026; rollout expected 2028.
60. **Acetic acid alternative:** CASFER (NSF Engineering Research Center). Vinegar-strength acetic acid from electrochemical processes. Peer-reviewed science confirms effectiveness as bio-based glyphosate alternative. Produced as co-product of phosphorus recovery.
61. **Pelargonic acid:** Various commercial sources. Natural contact herbicide from plant sources. Quick action, fast knockdown. Organic-compliant. No residual control—suited for spot treatments, not broadacre farming.
62. **Integrated vegetative management:** European Weed Research Society (2022). No single replacement—combination of site-specific planning, rotation of herbicide modes of action, mechanical control, monitoring with GIS and drones, cover crops.
- 

## Part 10: Safer Alternatives—Phosphorus

63. **Recovered from human waste:** Cunha, Schott, van der Weijden, Leal, Zeeman, Buisman. "Calcium phosphate granules recovered from anaerobic treatment of black water." Calcium phosphate granules contain 10 wt% phosphorus; after incineration: 15 wt% (removes organics, pathogens). Heavy metals and organic micropollutants below Dutch and EU regulatory limits. Can replace 12% of U.S. phosphate rock at current process conditions.

64. **CASFER electrochemical recovery:** CASFER (NSF Engineering Research Center). E-GROW™ patent-pending process. Transforms wastewater biosolids and manure into clean, slow-release organic-mineral fertilizers. Pathogen-free, odor-controlled. Can substitute up to 64% of U.S. inorganic phosphorus fertilizer use.
65. **Heterometal phosphate nanomaterials:** Prof. R. Murugavel, Indian Institute of Technology Bombay. Funded by Anusandhan National Research Foundation/Science and Engineering Research Board (2023-2026). Advanced synthesis of mixed metal phosphates for energy applications—electrode materials for water electrolysis, fuel cells, batteries, supercapacitors.
- 

## Part 11: Global Partners and Coalitions

66. **Global Impact Coalition (GIC) :** Global Impact Coalition. "Global Impact Coalition and Scope 3 Peer Group Join Forces to Accelerate Action on Low-Carbon Products from the Chemical Supply Chain." July 29, 2025. CEO-led platform driving chemical value chain toward circular, net-zero future. Incubated at World Economic Forum. Members: BASF, SABIC, Clariant, Covestro, LG Chem, LyondellBasell, Mitsubishi Chemical Group, Moeve, Syensqo, SUEZ.
67. **Henkel joins GIC:** Global Impact Coalition (2025). December 2025: Henkel Adhesive Technologies joined GIC. CEO Charlie Tan: "At a time when the industry is redefining itself under the weight of climate commitments and cost pressure, collaboration is the only credible path forward."
68. **Syensqo-Sinopec partnership:** World Energy. "Syensqo and Sinopec Collaborate on Advanced Materials and Specialty Chemicals." April 23, 2025. Strategic Partnership Framework Agreement for commercial aerospace, transportation, energy, electronics, industrial applications. Focus on carbon fiber, composite materials, specialty polymers, circular chemicals, carbon footprint reduction.
69. **Syensqo statement:** World Energy (2025). Dr. Ilham Kadri, CEO of Syensqo: "This partnership perfectly aligns with our goal to pursue breakthroughs that advance humanity. Together, we will develop innovative solutions that address the needs of modern industries while lowering environmental impact."
70. **Bayer Dynamic Shared Ownership (DSO) :** IMD Business School. "Bayer's Dynamic Shared Ownership: A Case Study." Implemented since 2023. Daniel Schneiders, Bayer Climate Program Director, led a DSO team that built a new decarbonization pathway in six months—a process that would have taken over a year under traditional structures.

"With DSO, we get the right people in the room. We define the goal, and we get to work. You don't wait for permission. You create progress."

---

## Part 12: Counter-Arguments and Opposition

71. **Will Harris / White Oak Pastures opposition:** Harris, W. (2026). Public statement opposing the February 2026 executive order. "We firmly believe moving away from these inputs in mass is not optional—it's necessary, and it's beyond time... We believe a more appropriate executive order would have declared the PROTECTION of our soils, water, and rural communities to be national security issues."
  72. **RFK Jr. on housing claims:** Yahoo Finance (2024). RFK Jr. claimed the Big Three could own 60% of single-family homes by 2030. While direct home buying by these firms is limited, private equity and large investors have been purchasing homes in bulk, particularly since 2008. Redfin report (late 2023): investors bought 26% of affordable homes.
- 

## Part 13: Academic and Historical Context

73. **"Hidden power of the Big Three"** : Fichtner, J., Heemskerk, E. M., & Garcia-Bernardo, J. (2017). *Business and Politics*. Cited in Yahoo Finance (2024). Documents the re-concentration of corporate ownership through passive index funds.
  74. **Shareholder democracy critique:** Gramitto Ricci, S. A. (2025). *Florida Law Review* (forthcoming). "The Vitruvian Shareholder" and related work examining the democratic deficit in corporate governance.
  75. **Historical origins of shareholder democracy rhetoric:** Ott, J. (2011). *When Wall Street Met Main Street: The Quest for an Investors' Democracy*. Harvard University Press. Documents how the term was crafted as marketing in the 1920s and later weaponized against government regulation.
- 

## Part 14: Open-Source Registry Platforms

76. **OpenG2P:** Digital Public Goods Alliance. Open-source platform enabling governments to build secure, inclusive registries for social benefit delivery. Recognized as a Digital Public Good. Handles change management, audit trails, interoperability.

77. **Diia.Engine**: Government of Ukraine. Open-source platform for state registries and online public services. Reduces development expenses by up to 50%; cuts implementation time 2-3 times faster than conventional methods. Over 70% compliance with GovStack standards.
  78. **Sovrium**: Self-hosted, configuration-driven open-source alternative to Airtable, Retool, and Notion. BSL-1.1 license (converts to Apache 2.0 in 2029). Philosophy: "Own your data. Own your tools. Own your future."
  79. **NocoBase**: 16.1k GitHub stars. "Data model + plugin-driven platform" with pluginized microkernel architecture. Fine-grained permission system; multi-database support.
  80. **Liquio**: AGPL-3.0-only open-source platform for public sector digital transformation. Designed for security, stability, scalability.
  81. **Jet Admin**: AI-powered no-code/low-code app builder. Freemium model. Can prototype in hours.
- 

#### **Part 15: Recent DPA Actions (as of March 2026)**

82. **February 2026 DPA phosphorus order**: The White House (2026).
  83. **March 2025 critical minerals order**: The White House (2025). Executive Order to expand domestic mineral production capacity using DPA.
  84. **April 2025 maritime industry order**: The White House (2025). Executive Order to revitalize America's maritime industry.
  85. **May 2025 nuclear fuel order**: The White House (2025). DPA invoked to enhance domestic capability for spent nuclear fuel management.
  86. **February 2026 Umicore award**: Department of Defense (2026). \$11.8 million DPA Title III award for optical materials processing capability in Oklahoma.
- 

#### **Part 16: Worker Cooperative Examples**

87. **KOOPERA (Spain)** : KOOPERA. Social cooperative with three decades of experience in textile waste management and employment integration. Processes chemical recycling of polyester waste (RESINTEX project). 2,467 textile containers; 36 second-hand shops; 396 employees. Revenue: 83% sales, 12% employment subsidies, 3% donations, 1% projects.

88. **Humana Nova (Croatia)** : Humana Nova. Non-profit eco-social enterprise combining textile waste management with inclusive employment. Removed 4,700+ tonnes of textiles from landfill. 58 employees including 33 people with disabilities. Revenue €2.4 million (2024); growth 35%+. "Key success factors include strong partnerships with private companies, a clear social mission, access to used textiles, and a self-sustaining diversified revenue model."
89. **Foodbank Australia Collaborative Supply Program**: Foodbank Australia. Nonprofit coordinating raw material supply across multiple private companies. Produces pasta, bread, eggs, pasta sauce, meat, breakfast cereal, canned tomatoes, coffee, fresh milk, fruits and vegetables, recipe bases.
90. **BEAM Circular (California)** : BEAM Circular. Nonprofit in North San Joaquin Valley turning agricultural waste into bio-based materials, chemicals, energy, food ingredients. \$750,000 line of credit from Nonprofit Finance Fund; grant funding from James Irvine Foundation (0% interest); loan guarantee from Nor-Cal FDC (part of California Infrastructure and Economic Development Bank).
- 

## Part 17: How Slavery Was Coordinated

[From Plantation to Platform: Capitalism and the Extractive Economy of Contemporary New Media](https://muse.jhu.edu/pub/236/edited_volume/chapter/3626110/) > [https://muse.jhu.edu/pub/236/edited\\_volume/chapter/3626110/](https://muse.jhu.edu/pub/236/edited_volume/chapter/3626110/)

- [Lisa Hinrichsen](#) > [https://muse.jhu.edu/search?action=search&query=author:Lisa%20Hinrichsen:and&min=1&max=10&t=query\\_term](https://muse.jhu.edu/search?action=search&query=author:Lisa%20Hinrichsen:and&min=1&max=10&t=query_term)
- [Louisiana State University Press](#) > [https://muse.jhu.edu/search?action=browse&limit=publisher\\_id:236](https://muse.jhu.edu/search?action=browse&limit=publisher_id:236)

Historians and political scientists identify **two primary models** of how slavery operated as a coordinated system :

### 1. "Slaves as the State" Model

In this model, enslaved soldiers and administrators were used to build and centralize political power. Rulers couldn't trust local nobles with family ties and competing loyalties. So they built armies and bureaucracies from enslaved people—deracinated, with loyalty only to the ruler.

### How it was coordinated:

- **Military campaigns** specifically for slave-taking (raiding across borders)
- **Administrative systems** run by enslaved officials
- **Succession planned** through slave-soldier hierarchies
- **Norms against enslaving insiders**—so raiding was always external

## 2. "Slaves Under the State" Model

Here, the economy itself was built on enslaved production, backed by state-enforced violence. Slaves were:

- The main labor force
- A commodity for trade
- A store of value
- Currency itself in some societies

### How it was coordinated:

- **Merchant networks** connected slave sellers in Africa to buyers in the Americas
- **Guarantee systems**—British merchants guaranteed payments for slave sales across continents, managing risk and volatility
- **Credit extended** based on human collateral
- **Insurance** underwrote voyages
- **Supply chains** moved people like commodities

### The "Push a Button" Coordination

One historian describes the plantation system as operating through "technologies that interlock the local and the global" :

"So push a button (with the index finger of your right hand) on the machine of the trading world, and things happen to benefit the man with sterling bills, a huge pile of cotton, a long roster of abundant credit that allows him to extend his reach across time and space."

**That's coordination without a central command.** No single person controlled the entire slave trade. But through:

- Shared norms (who could be enslaved)

- Shared financial instruments (credit, insurance, guarantees)
- Shared expectations (profits to be made)
- Shared violence (states backing the system)

...the machine ran itself.

---

### The Coordination Mechanisms, Side by Side

<b>What Was Coordinated</b>	<b>How Slavery Did It</b>	<b>How Today's System Does It</b>
<b>Who gets extracted</b>	Norms against enslaving insiders meant raiding always crossed borders	Norms against extracting from "customers" are weak; extraction targets everyone, but concentrated in communities without leverage
<b>Financial backing</b>	Merchant networks, guarantee systems, credit based on human collateral	Index funds, institutional voting, common ownership across competitors
<b>Risk management</b>	Insurance for slave voyages, diversified portfolios of human cargo	Diversified portfolios of companies, coordinated voting, shared expectations
<b>Supply chains</b>	African factors, Middle Passage, American plantations	Raw material extraction, manufacturing, distribution—all owned by same institutional investors
<b>Enforcement</b>	State-backed violence, slave patrols, legal codes	State-backed corporate law, SEC regulations, contracts that can't be negotiated
<b>Normalization</b>	Claims that slavery was "benevolent, paternal, and civilizing"	Claims that price hikes are "market forces," that institutional ownership is "passive"
<b>Silencing opposition</b>	Narratives that Africans were complicit, that Europe	Narratives that critics are "conspiracy theorists," that "this is just how things work"

	abolished slavery (rewriting history)	
--	---------------------------------------	--

---

### What Scholars Are Now Saying

The connection isn't just mine. Contemporary scholars are explicitly drawing the line from plantation to platform:

"Just as historians have now begun to see the connections between enslavement, once thought to be premodern, and modern capitalism, we might think about the ways that the plantation anticipates the rigors of modern digital life, wherein humans are reduced to quantifiable bodies, and the affect and labor they produce, are increasingly available for exploitation, trafficking, surveillance, and data extraction."

The plantation wasn't a premodern relic. It was a **technology of extraction** that perfected:

- Surveillance (watching enslaved workers)
- Standardization (turning humans into units)
- Financialization (using humans as collateral)
- Global supply chains (moving bodies across oceans)

**Today's system does the same thing, with different tools.**

---

### The "Collaborative Exploitation" Framework

The Max Planck Institute for the Study of Crime, Security and Law has launched a major research project called **MANUNKIND: Determinants and Dynamics of Collaborative Exploitation** .

Their framing:

"Chattel slavery and other forms of collaborative exploitation are with us since ancient times, inflicting unfathomable suffering on countless generations of victims. And even though slavery is outlawed globally today, its modern-day successors continue to cause severe harm for millions."

They're studying:

- The **incentive structures** that make exploitation possible
- The **psychological mechanisms** that enable people to participate
- How **macro-level patterns emerge from micro-level decisions**

This is exactly what you're describing: no single villain, but a system that coordinates exploitation without central command.

---

### The Key Difference

Here's where the parallel holds—and where it diverges.

#### What's the same:

- **Structural coordination** without central command
- **Externalization of harm** onto those without power
- **Financialization** of the extracted
- **Normalization** through narratives
- **Silencing** of opposition

#### What's different:

- Historical slavery was **legal ownership of humans**. Today's extraction is **legal ownership of companies that extract from humans**.
  - Historical slavery used **explicit violence**. Today's extraction uses **structural violence—wages that don't match costs, prices that rise everywhere, terms that change after you sign**.
  - Historical slavery was **abolished** (after centuries of resistance). Today's extraction is **barely named**.
- 

### What This Means for Your Argument

When you wrote:

"Is it a lose-lose situation?"

You were asking whether the system is **inescapable**.

The historical parallel says: **systems this entrenched feel inescapable. Until they're not.**

Slavery was global. It was ancient. It was woven into every economy. It was defended by law, religion, and science. And it fell.

Not because the system suddenly became moral. Because people built alternatives. Because enslaved people revolted. Because free people refused to participate. Because the machinery became visible.

Your registry of un-acquirable enterprises is the **alternative infrastructure**. It's the parallel track. It's the place where extraction can't reach.

---

**Compiled March 2026**

*With research assistance from OpenAI and Deepseek*