ChatGPT

Trickle-Up Economics and Bottom-Up Models: Historical Examples and Modern Applications

Introduction

"Trickle-up" economics refers to bottom-up economic models where prosperity is built by empowering those at the base of the economic pyramid (workers, consumers, local communities) rather than focusing primarily on the top. In contrast to **trickle-down** theories – which assume benefits granted to corporations and the wealthy will eventually "trickle down" to everyone – trickle-up approaches invest in the **grassroots**, expecting wealth and growth to **flow upward through increased demand and broad participation**. The intuition isn't new: during the Great Depression, humorist Will Rogers quipped that while money put at the top might *trickle down*, "he didn't know that money trickled up. Give it to the people at the bottom and the people at the top will have it before night, anyhow – but at least it will have passed through the poor fellow's hands" [1]. Modern evidence supports this idea: an IMF study found that when the income share of the **poorest 20%** increases, overall **GDP growth rises**, whereas increasing the top 20%'s share actually **slows growth** [2]. In other words, boosting the earnings and spending power of the many can drive a more dynamic and **inclusive economy**, validating a bottom-up philosophy. This answer explores historical and real-world examples of trickle-up economics and similar bottom-up models – from **corporate cooperatives and self-governing firms** to **universal basic income pilots and participatory budgeting** – highlighting how they distribute wealth, what outcomes they've achieved, and why they remain the exception rather than the rule. We also examine the barriers preventing wider adoption of these autonomy-first models and discuss what it would take to implement or test them today.

Trickle-Up vs Trickle-Down: Concept and Historical Roots

Trickle-Down Economics has long been the dominant narrative in policy – for example, the idea that tax cuts or incentives for the wealthy and big businesses will spur investment, job creation, and eventually benefit everyone. However, decades of experience and research have cast doubt on this approach's efficacy for broad prosperity. Nobel economist Joseph Stiglitz noted that **post–World War II growth** was not led by wealth at the top but rather by a strong middle class – effectively *"trickle-up economics"* fueled by broad-based gains [3] [2]. In fact, as mentioned, the IMF's analysis across many countries concluded **"the benefits do not trickle down"** when the rich gain more – instead, raising incomes at the bottom and middle leads to higher growth [2]. This evidence flips the script on the supply-side logic of past decades.

Historically, some industrialists and policymakers implicitly embraced trickle-up principles. A famous example is **Henry Ford's $5-a-day wage** in 1914: Ford dramatically raised his factory workers' wages, well above the prevailing rate. This move helped reduce rampant turnover and ensured a stable, productive workforce for his Model T assembly line. It also had a side-effect that Ford welcomed – workers with higher incomes could afford the very cars they built, boosting demand. Ford's pay policy *"doubled the average wage [and] likely boosted sales since the workers could now afford to buy the cars they were making"*, effectively **laying a foundation for a consumer-driven middle class economy** [4]. Whether altruistic or not, the episode demonstrated a **bottom-up multiplier**: better pay for ordinary workers led to greater productivity and a new mass market for goods. In the mid-20th century, broad social investments like the GI Bill (which sent millions of veterans to college and built suburban housing) and public infrastructure projects also exemplified bottom-up growth by expanding the middle class. These policies recognized that **empowering average households** – through education, housing, and wages – created the consumer demand and human capital that drove unprecedented growth in the 1950s–60s.

On the other hand, the limitations of trickle-down are evident in periods of rising inequality and stagnant wages. Over the last few decades, wealth concentrated at the top has often failed to "lift all boats." For instance, from the 1980s onward, many economies saw robust GDP and stock market gains, but middle and lower incomes barely budged in real terms. This has prompted renewed interest in *"bottom-up" or "middle-out" economics*, emphasizing broad-based income growth as the engine for sustainable development. As U.S. President Biden put it, *"the strongest economy is built from the bottom up and the middle out"*, rejecting the notion that benefits bestowed on the top will automatically reach the rest [5].

Below, we survey several **real-world implementations of bottom-up economic models** – in corporate settings, communities, and government policies – that illustrate *trickle-up economics in action*. We also identify examples aligned with **autonomy-first principles** (where decision-making power and benefit autonomy rest with individuals or lower-level entities) and discuss their outcomes.

Bottom-Up Models in Corporate Ecosystems and Workplaces

One arena where bottom-up principles have been applied is in **business organizations and corporate ecosystems**. Traditional corporations are hierarchical, with decisions and profits flowing upward to executives and shareholders. Bottom-up models invert or flatten this structure, emphasizing **worker autonomy, democratic governance, and broad profit-sharing**. These approaches treat employees, or even entire networks of smaller enterprises, as the primary drivers and beneficiaries of economic activity. Notable examples and experiments include worker cooperatives, employee-owned companies, and firms using **dynamic governance** (self-management practices).

Worker Cooperatives and Employee Ownership

Worker cooperatives are enterprises **owned and governed by their employees**, on a one-member one-vote basis. They embody autonomy-first principles by giving workers control over decisions and a share of profits. A flagship example is the **Mondragon Corporation** in Spain, the world's largest co-op network. Mondragon is a federation of about 95 cooperative companies – from manufacturing to finance – owned by around **80,000 worker-members** [6]. Each co-op's governance is democratic and there are **no outside shareholders siphoning profits**; instead, surplus earnings are reinvested or distributed to the worker-owners and the community. Notably, Mondragon maintains an internal wage solidarity: executives can earn at most roughly **6× the salary of the lowest-paid worker** [7], a radically flatter pay scale than typical corporations (for comparison, the average CEO of a large company might make 200×–300× their median employee's pay). This structure ensures wealth generated by the enterprise is far more evenly shared.

When times are good, **profits are shared** by Mondragon members (through dividends into individual capital accounts and community funds). In downturns, the co-ops support one another – e.g. shifting workers from a struggling unit to others or temporarily reducing hours/salaries by vote – to **preserve jobs** [8]. This mutual support system helped Mondragon weather crises with minimal layoffs. The resilience and solidarity mechanisms illustrate trickle-up logic: by prioritizing workers' welfare and keeping them employed (even if it means slightly lower short-term profits), the whole ecosystem sustains productivity and demand, which in turn benefits all stakeholders in the long run. Dismissals are rare and require democratic approval; as one article noted, a capricious firing like one engineer experienced at a conventional firm *"would be almost impossible within Mondragon"*'s worker-owned framework [9].

Empirical research on cooperatives globally finds they can be **competitive and even high-performing**. Economist Virginie Pérotin's analysis of decades of international data shows that, on balance, **worker cooperatives are as productive or more productive than conventional firms**, with employees often working "*better and smarter*" and operations organized more efficiently when workers have a direct stake [10]. Co-ops also tend to be **more durable**: they survive at least as long as other businesses and often **weather recessions better**, in part because worker-owners are willing to adapt (e.g. take pay cuts) rather than lay off their peers [11]. By **prioritizing worker autonomy and job security**, cooperatives build long-term stability. For example, during the 2008 recession, **U.S. employee-owned companies** (ESOPs) had **1/3 to 1/4 the layoffs** of comparable traditional firms [12], suggesting broad ownership creates a buffer against cutting jobs. This supports the idea that **wealth distribution and growth can go hand-in-hand** – giving workers ownership and voice can sustain performance while also yielding far more equitable outcomes.

However, these models face **barriers to broader adoption** (discussed more later). Access to capital is a common hurdle – co-ops can't easily issue stock to outside investors without undermining worker control, so they rely on member contributions, retained earnings, or cooperative banks (indeed Mondragon started its own bank in 1959 to finance new co-ops). Organizational culture is another factor: democratic decision-making and consensus can be slower than top-down directives, and not every enterprise succeeds in maintaining participation as they scale. (Mondragon has grappled with this in some subsidiaries and has a complex governance system to balance agility with democracy.) Skeptics like economist Larry Summers have argued that co-ops may sacrifice rapid expansion for the sake of existing members' comfort, making them "sleepy" [13] – yet Mondragon's growth into a multinational conglomerate challenges that stereotype. Still, outside Mondragon (which enjoys a supportive Basque culture), **cooperatives remain relatively niche**, comprising a small fraction of GDP in most countries. They require **training in self-management**, trust among members, and often supportive policies (legal frameworks, loan funds, technical assistance) to get started. Where those exist – for instance, Italy's *Emilia-Romagna* region has thousands of co-ops networked together, and France, Spain, and Quebec have strong cooperative federations – co-ops have flourished more visibly. The **lack of awareness and education** about the cooperative model also means many entrepreneurs never consider it, defaulting to the traditional investor-owned model [14].

Nonetheless, the successes of large worker-owned enterprises (like Mondragon, the **John Lewis Partnership** in the UK with ~80,000 employee co-owners, or the plethora of **smaller co-ops worldwide** from bakeries to engineering firms) provide **real-world proof of bottom-up governance**. These companies show that giving workers autonomy and a share of wealth can create competitive businesses *and* reduce internal inequality dramatically. In a very direct sense, **wealth "trickles up" within these firms** – value created on the shop floor flows to the workers themselves (as dividends, better pay, or community services) rather than pooling exclusively at the top or external shareholders. Over time, this can change local wealth distribution: for example, many Mondragon member-workers have built significant savings in their internal capital accounts (which they receive upon retirement), and the Basque region benefited from lower unemployment and poverty rates relative to other parts of Spain, partly credited to the cooperative economy's impact [15] [7].

Figure: Illustration of a cooperative economic model – workers collectively "carving up" the fruits of capital (profits) instead of wealth accumulating only at the top. In networks like Mondragon, each member has a stake and voice, aligning economic growth with broad wealth distribution.

Dynamically Governed and Self-Managed Firms

Beyond formal cooperatives, some private companies have experimented with **flattening hierarchies and pushing decision-making downward** – aligning with the idea of *"autonomy-first"* organization. These include firms adopting **Holacracy, sociocracy, or other self-management systems** that replace traditional bosses and departments with decentralized teams or "circles." The online retailer **Zappos** is one well-known case: in 2014, CEO Tony Hsieh implemented *Holacracy* at Zappos, eliminating managers in favor of a structure where employees hold roles in various circles and govern themselves by explicit rules. The goal was to **empower front-line staff** to act like "entrepreneurs" and increase agility and innovation by removing bureaucratic bottlenecks [16]. In theory, such dynamic governance is bottom-up since authority is distributed and decisions are made by those closest to the work, rather than always flowing from the top.

In practice, Zappos's transition was challenging – some employees found the new system confusing or too rigid in its own way (Holacracy has many formal rules and meetings) [17]. Over time Zappos modified its approach, reintroducing some managerial functions and loosening the strict Holacracy protocol by 2020 [17]. The experiment revealed that **cultural change** to a completely boss-less organization can be difficult, especially in a larger company. Similarly, the tech company **Valve** (developer of Steam and video games) is famous for its *"flat" organization* with no formal hierarchy – employees choose projects and leaders emerge organically. Valve credits this autonomy for its creativity, but even Valve's internal structure isn't entirely flat in practice (hidden power dynamics can still emerge). **W.L. Gore & Associates**, maker of Gore-Tex, has for decades used a *"lattice" organization* with no fixed org chart – associates self-organize into teams and leaders are chosen by peer respect. Gore has consistently been rated as innovative and a top workplace, indicating that **high employee autonomy and trust** can coincide with strong business outcomes (Gore has over $3 billion in annual revenue) [18]. These cases suggest **bottom-up governance in firms** can spur engagement and innovation – employees feel more "ownership" of decisions – but it requires the right culture, and results have been mixed when attempting to fully remove hierarchy.

Another form of bottom-up corporate ecosystem is where **employees share ownership broadly, but within a traditional corporate structure**. For example, **employee stock ownership plans (ESOPs)** in the U.S. allow workers in a company to collectively own significant equity (often via a trust). Companies like *Southwest Airlines, Publix Supermarkets,* and many mid-sized manufacturers have ESOPs that give employees a stake. While these are not democratic co-ops (management is usually still top-down), they do *"trickle up"* wealth by sharing stock value and dividends with all employees. Studies have found ESOP firms tend to have **higher productivity and growth** than peers, and employees accumulate substantially more wealth in retirement accounts than in non-ESOP firms [12] . The UK's **John Lewis Partnership** (mentioned above) operates department stores and supermarkets and is 100% owned by its ~80,000 employees through a trust – employees get annual profit-sharing (sometimes ~10–20% of salary) and elect representatives to influence company policy. John Lewis has survived for nearly a century with this model, often outperforming competitors, showing that large-scale **shared capitalism** can be both equitable and commercially viable.

In sum, **corporate bottom-up models** – from cooperatives to self-managed teams to broad employee ownership – illustrate that many **elements of autonomy and wealth-sharing can be built into business**. They support the idea that when workers are treated as key stakeholders (or the *only* stakeholders), the enterprise can achieve sustainable growth with far less inequality. Workers with higher pay or profit shares have more spending power (boosting the wider economy) and more motivation at work, creating a positive feedback loop. The *barriers* tend to be **institutional and cultural**: conventional investors may balk at these models (fearing lower returns or loss of control), executives may resist ceding authority, and the legal framework in some countries is oriented toward maximizing shareholder value, not stakeholder balance. Despite these challenges, a **global "new economy" movement** is pushing for more employee ownership and cooperative development as a means to tackle inequality. For example, cities like **Cleveland** and **Preston (UK)** have pursued "community wealth building" strategies where anchor institutions help seed worker-owned businesses – effectively cultivating local bottom-up ecosystems (discussed more below). Each success story builds knowledge on how to implement autonomy-first economics in the corporate world.

Bottom-Up Approaches in Communities and Broader Economic Systems

Bottom-up economics is equally potent at the community and macro level. Here, the focus is on **policies or systems that give power and resources directly to the people**, rather than relying on elite-driven development. This section covers examples like **participatory budgeting, universal basic income pilots, direct cash transfers, and other grassroots development models**. These initiatives often aim to improve **wealth distribution** and spur growth by enabling ordinary citizens to make decisions or to have the means to participate in the economy.

Participatory Budgeting and Local Empowerment

One pioneering bottom-up model in governance is **Participatory Budgeting (PB)**. First implemented in 1989 in **Porto Alegre, Brazil**, participatory budgeting allows citizens (especially in poor neighborhoods) to directly decide how a portion of the public budget is spent. Residents debate and vote on investment priorities – such as paving roads, extending water infrastructure, building schools – and the city allocates funds accordingly. This process flips the traditional top-down planning model by **giving local communities autonomy to allocate resources** based on their needs. The results in Porto Alegre were remarkable: **in**

less than a decade, access to basic services dramatically improved. From 1988 to 1997, **water and sewer connections expanded from 75% to 98% of all households** [19], bringing virtually the entire city reliable clean water. The number of public schools **quadrupled** in that period [20], and health and education's share of the budget nearly tripled. Not only were infrastructure gaps closed, but the investments were targeted to the poorest areas – something the previous political process had often neglected. By the late 1990s, *"99% of Porto Alegre's population was served by treated water and 85% by the sewage system,"* up from 70% and 46% (respectively) a decade earlier [21] [22]. Such gains in living standards exemplify *trickle-up development*: improving the lot of the poor improved overall social outcomes and likely the city's economic productivity (healthier, better-educated citizens contribute more).

Participatory budgeting has since spread to **thousands of cities worldwide** – from New York to Paris to villages in India – as a tool for inclusion and efficient spending. Studies find that PB tends to redirect funds towards basic needs (water, sanitation, housing) and can **increase civic engagement and transparency**, reducing waste and corruption [19] [23]. By involving citizens in decision-making, it treats them as **agents of development**, not passive beneficiaries. This aligns with autonomy-first principles: communities gain real power to shape their economic destiny. The challenge for PB is that usually only a **small fraction of the budget** is opened to direct public control (often capital investment funds, not salaries or debt payments). Thus, while PB can improve specific outcomes, it doesn't entirely overhaul public finance. Also, it requires supportive political leaders willing to share power, and active community organizing so that marginalized voices truly participate (ensuring meetings are accessible, etc.). Nonetheless, PB's success where it's well-implemented shows that **bottom-up governance can allocate resources effectively and equitably**, fostering development that "trickles up" from improved local conditions.

A related concept is **community wealth building** through anchor institutions and cooperatives. The **"Cleveland Model"** is a notable initiative: in Cleveland, Ohio (USA), a coalition of hospitals, universities, and foundations helped launch the **Evergreen Cooperatives** – worker-owned companies (a large laundry, a solar energy installer, and a hydroponic greenhouse) – to supply goods and services they were previously importing from outside [24] [25]. The anchors agreed to purchase from these local co-ops, providing a steady revenue base. The idea was to **root wealth in low-income neighborhoods** by creating green jobs with employee ownership, rather than letting procurement dollars "trickle out" to distant corporations. Early results saw dozens of jobs created for local residents who also build equity in the co-ops. For instance, the Evergreen Cooperative Laundry provides laundry services to big hospitals and allows its formerly low-wage workers to **build individual wealth via ownership stakes** [26]. This model takes a *bottom-up approach to urban economic development*: instead of luring an outside corporation with tax breaks (a top-down method that often yields low-paying jobs and profits that leave the community), it *grows new businesses from the bottom up* and keeps the profits circulating locally. **Wealth distribution** improves as workers share in profits, and if the businesses succeed, the surrounding area benefits from more stable employment and higher incomes. The model has inspired other cities (e.g. **Preston, England** adopted a similar approach of public procurement supporting local worker co-ops, known as the "Preston Model"). Scaling this requires patience and partnership – the Evergreen co-ops needed seed capital and technical support – and not all have thrived equally (the greenhouse struggled initially, for example). But it showcases an inventive *"trickle-up" urban policy*: invest at the bottom (local worker-owned firms) to revitalize the whole local economy.

Universal Basic Income and Direct Cash Transfer Experiments

Perhaps the most direct form of trickle-up economics is simply **giving people money**, no strings attached, and trusting that widespread benefits will result. This idea underpins **Universal Basic Income (UBI)** proposals and cash transfer programs. UBI means providing everyone (or everyone in a community) a regular **guaranteed income** sufficient to meet basic needs, thereby empowering individuals as economic actors. While true UBI at national scales has not yet been implemented, **numerous pilots and studies** have tested the effects of unconditional cash, and they offer compelling evidence for bottom-up models of welfare and development.

Developed Country Pilots: One high-profile experiment was Finland's **basic income trial (2017–2018)**. The government randomly selected 2,000 unemployed people and gave each **€560 per month** regardless of whether they found work, replacing some existing benefits. The goals were to see if basic income could simplify welfare bureaucracy and encourage people to take jobs (since the payment wouldn't stop if they became employed). The results: those receiving the basic income **reported significantly better well-being – higher life satisfaction, lower stress and mental strain, and greater confidence in their future** – compared to the control group [27]. This was during a time of economic uncertainty, and recipients appreciated the security and autonomy the income provided. However, **employment levels** did not differ notably between the groups [27]. In other words, the basic income *neither* spurred significantly more job-taking *nor* made people lazier – employment was roughly the same, but people were *happier and healthier*. This finding counters a common political objection that giving people money will sap their work ethic. In fact, by reducing stress, it might enable better long-term job seeking or entrepreneurship, though that didn't show up within the short two-year window. Finland's pilot demonstrated the *feasibility* of such a program administratively and showed **clear improvements in human well-being**, suggesting that broad-based economic security can "trickle up" into societal benefits like improved health.

In the United States, the city of **Stockton, California** ran the **Stockton Economic Empowerment Demonstration (SEED)** from 2019–2020, giving $500 per month to 125 randomly selected residents (in a city with high poverty) for two years. A study of the first year's outcomes found **striking results**: *"Residents who received the payments were twice as likely to gain full-time employment compared with other residents"* in the control group [28]. Specifically, full-time employment among basic income recipients rose from 28% to 40%, a much larger jump than the control group [29]. Recipients also showed improved mental health and reduced anxiety about making ends meet. Importantly, spending data showed the money was largely used on **food, utilities, and necessities**, not on temptation goods – less than 1% was spent on alcohol or tobacco [30]. These outcomes powerfully support the trickle-up hypothesis: giving modest unconditional cash to people in need *enabled* them to stabilize their lives and even *improve their employment prospects*, likely because they could afford transportation, child care, or the time to search for better jobs. In other words, a guaranteed income helped people become *more* productive and secure, which benefits the broader economy (through higher employment and consumption) – **the opposite of the "free money makes people lazy" trope**. Stockton's success has inspired dozens of other U.S. cities to launch similar guaranteed income pilots targeting low-income families. It suggests that **autonomy-first social policy** (trusting people to use resources wisely for their own lives) can produce better aggregate outcomes than tightly conditional welfare programs.

Figure: A community meeting in rural Kenya organized by the NGO GiveDirectly. In cash transfer programs, funds are given directly to individuals in a village, empowering them to make economic decisions – an example of bottom-up development in practice.

Developing Country Cash Transfers: Perhaps the most dramatic evidence for trickle-up economics comes from large-scale cash transfer experiments in developing countries, where boosting the poorest can have large multiplier effects. The charity **GiveDirectly** conducted a landmark study in rural **Kenya**, essentially dropping a *massive local stimulus* by giving poor households cash grants (funded by donors) and observing the community-wide impacts. Over about two years, more than **$10 million** was distributed to over 10,500 households in dozens of villages [31] [32] – an infusion equal to ~15% of the local GDP. The findings were striking: the transfers not only improved the welfare of recipients (as expected – hunger fell, assets like livestock and metal roofs increased, etc.), but also **boosted the incomes of their neighbors** who *didn't* receive cash [33]. Because recipients spent money on local goods and services, they created more demand for local businesses, who in turn hired more or earned more. There were **no significant inflation effects** – local supply adjusted with the increased demand – and social cohesion did not deteriorate (no widespread jealousy observed) [33]. Most astonishing, researchers calculated a **"fiscal multiplier" of about 2.6**: every $1 of cash delivered led to **$2.60 of total economic output** in the area [34]. This multiplier is higher than typical government stimulus multipliers in rich countries [34], indicating that in poor communities, extra income rapidly circulates and generates productive activity. In essence, **wealth injected at the bottom multiplies as it moves up through the local economy** – the very definition of trickle-up. Such evidence has led development experts to consider cash transfers as a powerful tool for poverty reduction and local growth. It also suggests that foreign aid or government programs might do better to put money directly in people's hands (to stimulate grassroots markets) rather than funding big top-down projects alone [35]. This idea is being partially tested in places like **India**, where proposals for basic income to replace some subsidies have been floated [36], and in some oil-rich countries considering citizen dividends.

Another example: the **"Mincome" experiment** in Canada in the 1970s provided a guaranteed income to residents of a town (Dauphin, Manitoba) for a few years. Analyses later found positive outcomes: hospitalizations and mental health complaints declined in Dauphin during the experiment, and most people continued working with only minimal reductions in work hours (mainly new mothers and teens stayed in school longer) – indicating better health and social outcomes when basic needs were assured. **Namibia** and **India** have also run basic income pilot projects in villages, finding improved nutrition, school attendance, and economic activity. These small-scale trials consistently show that when you **trust people with economic resources, they tend to use them wisely** to improve their circumstances, which then benefits the community.

Despite these promising results, *why don't we see full-fledged UBIs or more permanent cash programs?* The barriers are partly **political and ideological**. Critics worry about the cost of giving everyone a stipend (though some proposals are funded by consolidating other programs or via progressive taxes). There's also political resistance from those who prefer work requirements or fear that UBI is "socialist" or undermines the work ethic. Additionally, **power dynamics** play a role – existing welfare bureaucracies and vested interests (like companies that pay low wages and might have to increase pay if workers had a UBI safety net) can resist such change. There's also a genuine debate about whether limited public funds should go to a universal payout or be targeted to specific services. However, the pandemic response – where many countries sent stimulus checks or wage subsidies broadly – moved the idea of basic income into the mainstream conversation, as even **Pope Francis** and some governments (e.g. Spain for a while) suggested basic income-like policies as a response to economic crises [37].

Other Autonomy-First Economic Models and Initiatives

In the realm of economic systems theory, there have been proposals for **comprehensive bottom-up economies**. One is **Participatory Economics (Parecon)**, developed by Michael Albert and Robin Hahnel. Parecon is a theoretical model that would replace both markets and top-down planning with a network of **worker councils and consumer councils** who plan production and consumption through democratic deliberation and iterative coordination. It also features "balanced job complexes" to equalize empowerment (everyone would do a mix of rote and creative tasks) and remuneration based on effort rather than property or output. While **Parecon** has never been implemented at national scale – it's essentially a vision for a post-capitalist, self-managed economy – it influenced thinking on how a large economy might be organized on autonomy-first lines [38] [39]. Elements of it have been tried in smaller collectives. Similarly, experiments in **worker self-management on a societal scale** occurred in places like former **Yugoslavia** (in the 1960s–80s, enterprises were formally owned by their workers and managed through workers' councils under a socialist market hybrid). Yugoslav self-management had *mixed results*: it did create some enterprise-level democracy and better wage equality than Soviet-style economies, but macroeconomic issues (inflation, inefficiencies from soft budget constraints, and eventual political breakup) undermined it. Nonetheless, it was a real attempt at a *bottom-up socialist economy*, and some of its legacy persists in cooperative movements in the Balkans.

Modern technology is enabling new bottom-up economic coordination too: for example, **blockchain-based Decentralized Autonomous Organizations (DAOs)** allow people globally to pool funds and vote on their use, essentially creating Internet-native co-ops or investment funds. Some DAOs are experimenting with funding public goods or software development through token-holder votes, embodying participatory governance (though the "wealth" in crypto contexts has often been concentrated, and the jury is still out on long-term effectiveness). **Platform cooperatives** are another emerging idea – these are alternatives to gig-economy apps (like driver co-ops to compete with Uber, or artist-owned music streaming platforms) where the users or workers share ownership of the digital platform. They aim to distribute the wealth generated by tech more equitably among those who actually create the value (drivers, content creators, etc.). While still nascent, some platform co-ops have launched (e.g. *Driver's Seat* in the US for ride-hail data, *Resonate* for music streaming) to test this bottom-up digital economy model.

Community currencies and **mutual aid networks** also fit into bottom-up economics. For instance, the **Bristol Pound** (a local currency in an English city) or time-banking systems allow communities to retain and circulate value locally, strengthening local businesses and reciprocity. These are smaller-scale and adjunct to the main economy, but reflect people's desire for economic systems that serve local needs first.

Across all these initiatives, a common theme is **autonomy and participation**: giving individuals, workers, and communities more direct control over resources and decisions. This is believed to not only be *fairer* (morally or socially desirable) but also to create conditions for more **sustainable growth** – because when people have ownership and security, they invest in their skills, their localities, and future, rather than extracting for short-term gain.

Barriers to Wider Adoption of Bottom-Up Models

If trickle-up economics and bottom-up models have so many benefits, why are they not more widespread? The reasons are a mix of **systemic, political, and organizational factors**:

- **Entrenched Power Structures:** Traditional capitalism concentrates decision rights and profits with owners and top managers. Those actors often resist changes that would dilute their power or share wealth more broadly. For example, existing corporate owners are unlikely to voluntarily convert their companies into cooperatives or give workers control; they have a self-interest in maintaining the status quo. Similarly, political elites and wealthy individuals may oppose policies like higher minimum wages, stronger unions, or basic income (the very mechanisms of trickle-up) because it could mean higher taxes or less leverage for them. Historically, transformative bottom-up policies often needed pressure from social movements (labor unions, civil rights, etc.) or crises to be implemented.

- **Access to Capital and Scale Challenges:** As noted, worker co-ops and other non-traditional enterprises face hurdles raising startup capital. Investors typically want equity and control, which conflicts with a cooperative model. While there are cooperative banks and credit unions, the mainstream financial system is not tailored to fund bottom-up enterprises. This **capital bias** keeps such firms relatively rare. Additionally, scaling a bottom-up initiative can be harder – e.g., a cooperative may grow more slowly because it doesn't take on venture capital, or participatory processes may become unwieldy in very large groups (though Mondragon and others have shown scale is possible with federations). Organizational innovations (like second-tier co-op federations, or use of digital tools for participation) are helping, but the path is not as well-trodden as the traditional models, so there's a *knowledge gap* in how to scale and sustain bottom-up systems.

- **Cultural and Educational Factors:** Decades (even centuries) of theory have taught business leaders and economists a top-down view: that clear hierarchies and profit-maximization for shareholders are the only efficient way. The merits of worker cooperation, community ownership, or unconditional welfare are underrepresented in business schools and economic textbooks. As a result, there's a kind of **ideological inertia**. People often simply haven't seen alternatives in action. For instance, an entrepreneur might not even think of structuring their new company as a cooperative because it's not in the mainstream playbook (despite that model potentially fitting their mission). Likewise, many voters might instinctively distrust ideas like UBI because they've been culturally primed to think "people should earn their keep" through jobs, even when jobs are not providing a living wage. Overcoming these biases requires education and exposure to success stories to legitimize bottom-up approaches.

- **Legal and Policy Environment:** In some jurisdictions, laws make bottom-up models harder. For example, co-determination (workers on company boards) is mandated in countries like Germany and has led to more worker influence in large firms, but in many countries it's not required or even discouraged. Cooperative businesses may face double taxation or lack appropriate legal forms in certain places (though many countries do have co-op incorporation statutes now). On the welfare side, means-tested and conditional programs are the norm; moving to something universal like UBI is a massive shift that requires restructuring tax systems and budgets. The **political feasibility** can be low unless there is a strong consensus or a champion for these reforms. Even when pilots succeed, translating that into permanent policy is a hurdle – for instance, the successful Stockton experiment did not immediately lead California or the U.S. to adopt a broader guaranteed income (though it did spur more local trials). Similarly, Finland's government did not extend the basic income after the pilot, partly due to political change. This shows a gap between pilot evidence and policy adoption, often due to partisan divides or concerns about costs and program design.

- **Fear of Failure and Transition Costs:** There is a certain risk-aversion to overhauling systems. A company might fear losing productivity during a transition to self-management (as Zappos experienced some chaos during Holacracy adoption). A government might fear that implementing a radical new economic model could lead to unforeseen problems (inflation, capital flight, etc.). These fears mean that many stick with "tried and true" (even if imperfect) models. It's notable that many bottom-up initiatives have emerged during crises or out of necessity – e.g., Argentina saw a wave of worker cooperatives formed by employees taking over factories during its 2001 economic crisis, essentially because the alternative was closure. Absent a crisis, making the case for change is harder.

- **Coordination and Collective Action Problems:** Bottom-up models often require high levels of trust and cooperation. For instance, a group of employees must collectively decide to form a co-op and work through decisions together – not everyone may want that responsibility or effort compared to having a boss make the calls. In communities, participatory budgeting or co-management of resources requires time and civic engagement from busy citizens. These "transaction costs" and the need for collective action can impede implementation. Over time, if the processes prove their worth (as they did in Porto Alegre, which saw increasing participation once people saw results), these costs are overcome. But initially, getting buy-in and participation can be a challenge – it asks people to do the work of governance that they're not used to doing in a top-down world.

In summary, **systemic inertia, power dynamics, and perceived risks** all slow the spread of bottom-up economics. There is also a dynamic of **incumbent versus new entrants**: established firms and wealthy individuals largely benefit from the current system, while the would-be beneficiaries of bottom-up models (workers, the poor, small entrepreneurs) have less influence to demand change. However, as inequality concerns rise and as traditional models struggle to address certain issues (like gig economy precarity or regional underdevelopment), interest in alternatives is growing.

What Would It Take to Implement and Test Bottom-Up Models Today?

Despite the barriers, there are concrete steps and conditions that could enable more trickle-up, autonomy-first models to flourish:

- **Policy Support and Experiments at Larger Scales:** Government action can greatly accelerate bottom-up economics. For example, a government could enact policies favoring employee ownership – such as tax incentives for companies that create ESOPs or for owners who sell their business to the employees (some countries already do this). This would help transfer more wealth and control to workers over time. Likewise, legalizing and supporting **cooperatives** (through technical assistance programs, co-op development funds, and including co-ops in small business support) can grow the cooperative sector. Governments could also run larger-scale **basic income pilots** or even phased rollouts. For instance, one proposal is to implement a modest UBI for a certain region or age group first (like a "Youth Dividend" or a "Senior Basic Income") and rigorously measure outcomes on health, crime, entrepreneurship, etc., building the case for expansion. Funding might come from carbon taxes (to create a climate dividend), wealth taxes, or reallocating inefficient subsidies. Political will is key – electing leaders with mandates to address inequality boldly would open space for such experiments. Notably, **coalitions of cities** are starting to do this bottom-up: the **Mayors for a Guaranteed Income** network in the U.S. is pooling lessons from dozens of city pilots, and could pave the way for state or federal adoption.

- **Institutional Innovations (Public Banks, etc.):** To overcome the capital gap for bottom-up enterprises, new financial institutions and instruments are needed. Public or community-owned banks that have social mandates can provide patient capital to cooperatives, community projects, and small businesses. For example, **Banco Palmas** in Brazil and various credit unions have financed local micro-enterprises that big banks ignore. Governments could seed **co-op development funds** that make low-interest loans to start-ups that are worker or community-owned. Another idea is using *pension funds* or union funds to invest in employee-ownership transitions (in effect, workers financing workers). Such ecosystem support can dramatically increase the number of cooperative or employee-owned businesses (as seen in Italy with the *Marcora Law*, which helps unemployed workers buy out companies and turn them into co-ops).

- **Education and Training in Self-Management:** Implementing autonomy-first models requires equipping people with the skills to participate. This means more training in collaborative decision-making, financial literacy for worker-owners, and management techniques for flat organizations. If a government or large NGO wants to replicate Mondragon's success, for example, they might establish a **"Cooperative University"** or partner with existing colleges to teach cooperative business management. (Mondragon actually has its own university that grooms people in cooperative values and skills.) In companies, change management programs are needed if moving to self-managed teams – employees and managers both need coaching to navigate new roles. Simply dropping hierarchy without guidance can backfire, so having mentors or consultants experienced in systems like Holacracy or sociocracy can help make the transition smoother. The more success stories are documented and taught, the easier it becomes for others to follow without "reinventing the wheel."

- **Gradual Hybrid Approaches:** We don't necessarily have to flip a switch from top-down to bottom-up; hybrid models can be stepping stones. For instance, companies can start with **gain-sharing or profit-sharing** plans (so workers get a direct cut of profits) and set up **worker committees** to give input on decisions, even if they don't fully democratize governance. Over time, these can evolve into deeper forms of employee ownership or representation (many ESOP companies eventually give workers board seats or voting stock). In government, **participatory budgeting** can be expanded gradually – a city might start by allowing citizen allocation of 5% of the budget, then increase that share if successful, building confidence in citizen decisions. *Learning-by-doing* through incremental change can mitigate fears and prove the concept, making broader adoption more palatable.

- **Leveraging Technology for Decentralization:** Modern technology offers tools to coordinate bottom-up efforts at scale. For example, digital platforms can enable thousands of cooperative members or citizens to vote on proposals efficiently (using secure voting apps), or to transparently track budgets (using blockchain ledgers for community funds). Online forums and collaborative software can connect distributed teams in a self-managed company so they can make decisions without a central office. Some UBI advocates suggest that if automation continues to displace jobs, we might distribute the productivity gains via digital currency as a basic income – essentially **automating trickle-up** by design. While technology isn't a panacea, it can reduce the "friction" of democratic participation and make decentralized systems more feasible by handling complex coordination (e.g. algorithmic matching of supply and demand in a participatory economy simulation). Governments and organizations interested in bottom-up models should invest in these tools and ensure they are accessible to all (to avoid a new digital divide).

- **Shifts in Measurement and Mindset:** Finally, a subtle but important factor is what we measure as "success." Top-down models tend to prioritize aggregate metrics like GDP growth or corporate profit, sometimes at the expense of distribution. If instead we focus on **median income growth, poverty reduction, community well-being indices, or employee satisfaction**, bottom-up approaches shine. For instance, if a country measures its progress by how much the **bottom 50%** gained (rather than just averaging gains), policies like wage increases, basic income, and cooperatives become more obviously beneficial and politicians have an incentive to enact them. The New Zealand government's adoption of a "Wellbeing Budget" framework is an example of reframing success beyond GDP. When success is defined in inclusive terms, trickle-up strategies find a more receptive environment.

In conclusion, moving toward trickle-up, autonomy-first economics will likely require a combination of **policy innovation, cultural change, and demonstration projects**. As more data accumulates showing these models work – e.g. the IMF endorsing that raising the poor's income boosts growth [40], or cities seeing crime drop with guaranteed income – it chips away at resistance. We may not replace our current system overnight, but we could incorporate *bottom-up principles* more and more into the existing framework: strengthening the bargaining power of workers (through higher minimum wages and strong labor rights), expanding profit-sharing and employee ownership, using fiscal policy to invest in the poor and the public (education, healthcare, green jobs), and involving citizens directly in economic decisions. Each of these moves the needle toward an economy where **prosperity is built by empowering the many**.

Conclusion

Trickle-up economics and bottom-up models offer a compelling vision for a more equitable and participatory economy – one where growth is driven by **broad prosperity and human empowerment** rather than hoping wealth concentrated at the top will somehow seep down. Historical anecdotes like Henry Ford's wage increase and bold policies like the post-WWII GI Bill showed the power of investing in the masses to create growth. Real-world examples in modern times – from **Mondragon's cooperatives sharing profits with tens of thousands of worker-owners** to **basic income experiments freeing people to improve their lives** – provide evidence that bottom-up approaches can work in practice. These models support **autonomy-first principles**, proving that when people are given control and a fair share, they often repay that trust with greater engagement, productivity, and ingenuity, creating value that benefits all.

Yet, as we've discussed, such models remain outside the mainstream due to structural barriers and ingrained habits. Overcoming these will require intentional effort: enlightened policies to redistribute power and resources, willingness to experiment and even fail on the way to figuring out new systems, and a shift in public mindset about what truly drives prosperity. The late 20th century was dominated by a top-down paradigm that yielded growth but also glaring inequality and instability. The early 21st century, facing new challenges like automation and climate change, may well demand a different approach – one that taps the **collective intelligence and energy of communities and workers** through bottom-up economics. As more pilot programs and local initiatives bloom (from cooperative business networks to guaranteed income programs), they build a repertoire of "what works" in diverse contexts. These can be scaled up with support and advocacy.

Ultimately, the question is not *can* trickle-up models work – history and research increasingly say yes – but whether we have the **political will and imagination** to implement them. If we do, we might unlock not only more equitable wealth distribution, but also a more robust and **resilient economic growth** that truly benefits society at large. The evidence suggests that empowering people at the ground level is not just a matter of justice, but a smart strategy for prosperity. In the long run, an economy that grows *from the bottom and middle* might prove more sustainable and innovative than one that tries to pull everyone up from the top. The challenge and opportunity before us is to test this proposition on a larger canvas, learning and adapting as we build economies that work *of, by, and for* the people from the ground up.

Sources

- Will Rogers on "money trickling up" (1932) [1]; IMF study on income share and GDP growth [2]; Stiglitz's observations on post-war growth and trickle-up [3].
- **Cooperatives and Worker Ownership:** New Yorker on Mondragon's structure and scale [7] [8]; The Nation summary of Pérotin's research on co-op productivity and resilience [10] [11]; Wikipedia on co-op performance in recessions [12]; Mondragon wage ratio and employment [7] [6].
- **Self-Management in Firms:** Zappos Holacracy account (Quartz/HBR) [17] [16]; W.L. Gore lattice structure (Participedia) [18].
- **Participatory Budgeting:** Planners Network on Porto Alegre outcomes [19]; Sabinet journal on water/sewer expansion [21].
- **Community Wealth Building:** Evergreen Cooperatives description [24]; Shelterforce on Evergreen Laundry (worker operating machinery) [41].

- **Basic Income and Cash Transfers:** Guardian on Finland's basic income results [27]; Washington Post on Stockton's guaranteed income results [30] [28]; Vox on GiveDirectly Kenya study (2.6× multiplier) [34]; Vox on absence of inflation and social conflict in Kenya cash experiment [33].
- **Other References:** NPR on Henry Ford's wage doubling and impact [4]; Guardian on Spain considering basic income and global interest [37]; and various theoretical and news sources on participatory economics and cooperatives [38] [42].

---

[1] [3] Trickle-down economics - Wikipedia
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Trickle-down_economics

[2] [40] Pay low-income families more to boost economic growth, says IMF | International Monetary Fund (IMF) | The Guardian
https://www.theguardian.com/business/2015/jun/15/focus-on-low-income-families-to-boost-economic-growth-says-imf-study

[4] The Middle Class Took Off 100 Years Ago ... Thanks To Henry Ford? : NPR
https://www.npr.org/2014/01/27/267145552/the-middle-class-took-off-100-years-ago-thanks-to-henry-ford

[5] Remarks by President Biden on His Middle-Out, Bottom-Up ...
https://bidenwhitehouse.archives.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2024/12/10/remarks-by-president-biden-on-his-middle-out-bottom-up-economic-playbook/

[6] [7] [8] [9] [13] How Mondragon Became the World's Largest Co-Op | The New Yorker
https://www.newyorker.com/business/currency/how-mondragon-became-the-worlds-largest-co-op

[10] [11] Worker Cooperatives Are More Productive Than Normal Companies | The Nation
https://www.thenation.com/article/archive/worker-cooperatives-are-more-productive-than-normal-companies/

[12] Worker cooperative - Wikipedia
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Worker_cooperative

[14] Do we all accept the findings of Virginie Perotin's research ... - Reddit
https://www.reddit.com/r/CapitalismVSocialism/comments/kt18kt/do_we_all_accept_the_findings_of_virginie/

[15] In this Spanish town, capitalism actually works for the workers
https://www.csmonitor.com/Business/2024/0513/income-inequality-capitalism-mondragon-corporation

[16] Beyond the Holacracy Hype
https://hbr.org/2016/07/beyond-the-holacracy-hype

[17] Zappos has quietly backed away from holacracy - Quartz
https://qz.com/work/1776841/zappos-has-quietly-backed-away-from-holacracy

[18] The Unconventional Success of W.L. Gore & Associates
https://flowchainsensei.wordpress.com/2024/01/14/the-unconventional-success-of-w-l-gore-associates/

[19] [20] Participatory Budgeting In Porto Alegre, Brazil – Planners Network
https://www.plannersnetwork.org/2000/03/participatory-budgeting-in-porto-alegre-brazil/

[21] Participatory budgeting in Porto Alegre - Sabinet African Journals
https://journals.co.za/doi/pdf/10.10520/AJA0259188X_643

[22] Participatory Budgeting in Porto Alegre, Brazil Boaventura de Sousa ...
https://www.boaventuradesousasantos.pt/documentos/chapter13.pdf

[23] Participatory Budgeting Includes Community Members in the Public ...
https://www.resilience.org/stories/2025-03-18/participatory-budgeting-includes-community-members-in-the-public-funding-process/

[24] Death, Taxes and Dirty Laundry: Evergreen Cooperative Laundry
https://www.nado.org/death-taxes-and-dirty-laundry-evergreen-cooperative-laundry/

[25] Evergreen Cooperatives Adapt and Grow
https://www.fiftybyfifty.org/2021/03/evergreen-cooperatives-adapt-and-grow/

[26] Evergreen Cooperatives
https://www.evgoh.com/

[27] [37] Finnish basic income pilot improved wellbeing, study finds | Universal basic income | The Guardian
https://www.theguardian.com/society/2020/may/07/finnish-basic-income-pilot-improved-wellbeing-study-finds-coronavirus

[28] [30] Study of Stockton’s universal basic-income program shows success - The Washington Post
https://www.washingtonpost.com/nation/2021/03/03/stockton-universal-basic-income/

[29] Guaranteed income: Stockton, CA - Economic Mobility Catalog
https://catalog.results4america.org/case-studies/guaranteed-income-stockton

[31] [32] [33] [34] [35] [36] Basic income charity GiveDirectly dropped millions in cash on rural Kenya | Vox
https://www.vox.com/future-perfect/2019/11/25/20973151/givedirectly-basic-income-kenya-study-stimulus

[38] Are there any examples of a Participatory Economy in practice?
https://participatoryeconomy.org/faqs/are-there-any-examples-of-a-participatory-economy-in-practice/

[39] We Need an Economy Without Bosses and Managers. Participatory ...
https://truthout.org/articles/we-need-an-economy-without-bosses-and-managers-participatory-economics-is-how/

[41] Cleveland Model for Worker Cooperative Stands Test of Time
https://shelterforce.org/2021/03/09/despite-a-rocky-start-cleveland-model-for-worker-co-ops-stands-test-of-time/

[42] Are Worker Cooperatives a Viable Way to Promote a More Equitable ...
https://thesolutionsjournal.com/worker-cooperatives-viable-way-promote-equitable-economy/