POLICY AND INDUSTRY WHITE PAPER

THE COHERENCE CRISIS

Why the UK's Industrial Automation Stagnation Is a Political Problem, and Why Federated Cooperative Enterprise Is the Only Structural Answer

A comprehensive analysis of market fragmentation, centralisation risk, and cooperative alternatives for UK industrial robotics

April 2026

United Kingdom

Contents

1. Executive Summary

The United Kingdom's industrial automation and robotics sector is stagnating, and the roots of this crisis extend far deeper than technical skill shortages or capital investment gaps. This document contends that the stagnation is, at its core, a political and structural problem, one created by the fundamental organisation of industry itself, and that without addressing the underlying political economy, no amount of government funding, training programmes, or innovation hubs will resolve it.

Technology, by its very nature, demands a degree of coherence, of standardisation, of systems thinking, in order to function effectively. A robot cell is not merely a machine; it is a convergence of mechanical engineering, electrical systems, software architecture, safety frameworks, communication protocols, and human operational knowledge. Each of these layers must be integrated into a functioning whole. This integration requires coordination, and coordination requires some degree of centralisation, at least at the level of technical standards and knowledge exchange.

The problem is that British industry remains organised around a fractured market system of competing private interests, layered supply chains, proprietary ecosystems, and short term commercial incentives that actively resist the kind of technical coherence that automation demands. The result is an industrial landscape littered with incompatible hardware, competing software platforms, duplicated engineering effort, and a workforce that is perpetually fragmented across vendor specific silos. This is not a market failure in the narrow economic sense. It is the market functioning exactly as designed, in a way that is structurally incompatible with the systemic integration that modern automation requires.

This white paper argues that the only structural solution which preserves individual autonomy, prevents authoritarian centralisation, and simultaneously creates the technical coherence necessary for a functioning national automation capability is a network of federated cooperative enterprises, operating at national scale. Such a model would democratise access to hardware through collective purchasing power, eliminate the wasteful duplication of software solutions through shared internal platforms, create accessible pathways into the industry for displaced workers, students, and apprentices, and, most critically, provide working people with ownership, dignity, and community in an era where traditional employment is being hollowed out by the very technologies this industry produces.

> **Key Thesis**

> *The UK automation crisis is not a technical problem with technical solutions. It is a political problem requiring a political, structural, and institutional answer.*

2. The State of Play: UK Industrial Automation in Numbers

Before examining the structural causes, it is essential to grasp the sheer scale of the UK's underperformance in industrial automation. The numbers are not merely disappointing; they represent a systemic failure that has been decades in the making, and which continues to accelerate relative to international competitors.

2.1 Robot Density: A Measure of National Capability

The International Federation of Robotics (IFR) publishes an annual metric known as robot density, which measures the number of industrial robots deployed per 10,000 manufacturing workers. This figure serves as a proxy for a nation's capacity to integrate automation into its productive economy. The UK's position on this metric is bleak. With approximately 112 robots per 10,000 workers, the UK sits at roughly half the European Union average of 208, roughly a quarter of Germany's 415, and barely a tenth of South Korea's world leading 1,012. Among G7 nations, the UK has consistently recorded the lowest robotics adoption rate.

112

Industrial robots per 10,000 UK manufacturing workers

415

Germany's robot density

1,012

South Korea's robot density

These are not abstract numbers. They translate directly into productivity. British manufacturing workers have access to 47 percent less machinery, tools, and technology than their counterparts in comparable economies. Between 2005 and 2023, the UK fell from 10th to 19th place on the Competitive Industrial Performance Index, a measure of a nation's ability to produce and export manufactured goods. The UK's share of global manufacturing dropped from 3.1 percent in 2000 to 1.9 percent in 2022, while its share of manufacturing exports fell from 3.7 percent to 1.5 percent over the same period.

2.2 Installation Trends: A One Off Peak

In 2024, UK industrial robot installations fell by 35 percent to just 2,500 units, according to the IFR World Robotics 2025 report. The previous year's figure of 3,800 units had been a temporary peak driven entirely by the Treasury's "super deduction" tax credit programme, which ended after the first quarter of 2023. Stripped of that fiscal stimulus, installation counts reverted to the same sideways trend that has characterised the UK market for a decade. Globally, 542,000 industrial robots were installed in 2024, more than double the figure from ten years ago. Annual installations have exceeded 500,000 units for the fourth consecutive year. The UK's share of this global activity is vanishingly small: 2,500 out of 542,000, less than 0.5 percent. The UK ranks 19th worldwide in robot installations, behind not only established industrial economies but emerging markets that are rapidly scaling their automation capabilities.

> **Quick Fact**
> *UK robot installations dropped 35% in 2024 to just 2,500 units. The 2023 peak of 3,800 was entirely driven by a now expired tax incentive, not structural demand.*

2.3 The Skills Gap: 70,000 Vacancies and Counting

The UK manufacturing sector currently faces approximately 70,000 vacancies. Nearly half of British manufacturers identify a lack of technical skills as the single biggest obstacle to adopting advanced technologies. A McKinsey Global Industrial Robotics Survey found that 61 percent of companies globally cite a lack of automation experience as an obstacle, while 30 percent report difficulties recruiting qualified employees. In the UK context, this problem is compounded by the fragmentation of training provision, the absence of coherent career pathways, and the small and medium enterprise (SME) dominated structure of the manufacturing base.

Of the UK's approximately 140,000 manufacturing businesses, 99 percent are SMEs. Of the 27,000 companies employing between 10 and 249 people, roughly 40 percent operate in the metalworking sector. The automation adoption rate among SMEs stands at approximately 4 percent, compared with 28 percent in large businesses.

4%

Automation adoption rate among UK SMEs, compared with 28% in large firms

These SMEs constitute the backbone of the UK's manufacturing supply chain, yet they are precisely the firms least equipped to navigate the fragmented, vendor locked, capital intensive landscape of industrial automation. They lack the management experience, digital skills, and institutional support structures needed to identify, procure, integrate, and maintain robotic systems. The closure of the Manufacturing Advice Service in 2015 removed one of the few state provided support mechanisms available to these firms, and nothing adequate has replaced it.

2.4 The £150 Billion Opportunity Cost

Industry estimates suggest that if British manufacturers were to match the technological capabilities of their global competitors, the resulting productivity gains could add £150 billion to the UK economy by 2035, representing a five percent increase in GDP. The manufacturing sector currently accounts for 10 percent of GDP; increasing this to 15 percent, a figure more in line with comparable economies, would add approximately £142 billion. These are not speculative projections from fringe analysts. They come from mainstream industry bodies and are broadly accepted across the political spectrum. The question is not whether the UK needs to automate. It is why, given the scale of the opportunity, it has so consistently failed to do so.

3. The Coherence Problem: Why Technology Demands Integration

To understand why the UK's automation sector is stagnating, we must first understand what technology actually requires in order to function. This is not a philosophical abstraction. It is an engineering reality that shapes every robot cell, every production line, and every automated warehouse on the planet.

3.1 The Nature of Technical Systems

A modern industrial robot cell is not a single machine. It is a system of systems: a six axis manipulator with its own controller and programming language, a safety system governed by international standards such as ISO 10218 and ISO 13849, a vision system for part recognition, a PLC managing the broader cell logic, a fieldbus protocol connecting sensors and actuators, a Human Machine Interface for operator interaction, and increasingly, higher level software for data logging, predictive maintenance, and integration with enterprise resource planning systems. Each of these components may come from a different manufacturer, speak a different protocol, and be configured using different software. The KUKA robot speaks KRL. The ABB robot speaks RAPID. The Fanuc robot speaks Karel. The Siemens PLC speaks Structured Text or Ladder Logic. The safety system has its own hardware and software layer. The vision system, whether from Cognex, Keyence, or Sick, has its own interface, its own calibration routines, its own data formats.

Making all of these components work together, reliably, safely, and efficiently, is the core challenge of industrial automation. It is not a matter of plugging things in. It is a matter of deep systems integration, which requires broad multi vendor knowledge, significant engineering time, and continuous problem solving. This is the coherence problem: technology, by its very nature, tends towards integration, towards common standards, towards shared protocols, towards systemic thinking. But the market within which this technology is produced and sold is organised in precisely the opposite direction.

3.2 The Fragmentation Landscape

Consider the sheer scale of the fragmentation. In the industrial robotics market alone, the major robot manufacturers, KUKA, ABB, Fanuc, Yaskawa, Universal Robots, Mitsubishi, Kawasaki, Stäubli, Epson, Doosan, each maintain proprietary programming languages, proprietary controller architectures, proprietary teach pendants, and proprietary simulation environments. A programmer skilled in KUKA KRL cannot simply walk onto a site running Fanuc robots and begin working. The knowledge does not

transfer without significant retraining. This is before we even consider the peripheral ecosystem: the dozens of competing vision system providers, the multiple PLC platforms (Siemens, Allen Bradley, Beckhoff, Mitsubishi, Omron), the various fieldbus protocols (Profinet, EtherNet/IP, EtherCAT, CC Link, Modbus), the different safety relay manufacturers, the competing HMI platforms, and the growing number of software tools for offline programming, digital twin simulation, and cloud connectivity.

> **The Integration Tax**
>
> *Every robot cell is a bespoke integration project. The industry has no equivalent of USB, no plug and play, no universal operating system. Each project reinvents the wheel, and each integrator pays the price in engineering hours, debugging time, and customer frustration.*

The ARIA (Advanced Research and Invention Agency) report on robotics modularity and interoperability confirmed this reality in stark terms. Survey respondents acknowledged that the bespoke nature of many current solutions, where projects are custom tailored for specific applications, fundamentally hampers interoperability and data sharing. Different simulation platforms are not interoperable. If one team uses Simulator A and another uses Simulator B, sharing training results between them is non trivial. Efforts get duplicated and results cannot be easily compared or combined. This fragmentation is not a temporary growing pain. It is a structural feature of a market system in which every vendor has a commercial incentive to lock customers into their proprietary ecosystem, because proprietary lock in is where the profit margins live.

3.3 The Human Cost of Fragmentation

The fragmentation of the automation industry has a direct and measurable human cost. It makes the sector inaccessible to new entrants, it burns out experienced engineers through the relentless demands of bespoke integration work, and it creates a skills landscape so fractured that no single training pathway can adequately prepare someone for the reality of the job.

A young person considering a career in robotics today faces a bewildering array of choices, none of which provide a clear pathway. Should they learn KUKA or Fanuc? Siemens or Allen Bradley? ROS 2 or proprietary middleware? Cognex or Keyence? Each choice narrows their employability in one direction while closing doors in others. The industry's own job listings reflect this confusion: titles like "Robotics Engineer," "Automation Engineer," "Mechatronics Engineer," "Controls Engineer," "Integration Engineer," and "Systems Engineer" all describe overlapping but distinct skill sets, and employers increasingly expect candidates to demonstrate competence across an impossibly broad range of vendor specific platforms.

This is not a skills gap in the traditional sense, a shortage of qualified people who could be trained. It is a structural feature of an industry that has made itself nearly impossible to enter, because the knowledge required is so fragmented, so vendor specific, and so poorly standardised that even experienced professionals find themselves constantly relearning, constantly adapting to new proprietary systems, and constantly fighting the same integration battles on project after project. The result is an industry that drives talented people away rather than drawing them in.

4. Why the Market Cannot Fix This: The Political Economy of Fragmentation

The fragmentation described in the previous chapter is not an accident. It is the predictable outcome of a market system organised around competing private interests, short term profit maximisation, and the structural incentives of capitalist competition. Understanding this is essential, because it means that market based solutions, however well intentioned, cannot resolve the underlying problem. The coherence crisis is not a market failure. It is the market working as intended.

4.1 Proprietary Lock In as Business Strategy

Every major automation vendor has a rational commercial incentive to maintain proprietary ecosystems. When a manufacturer invests in KUKA robots, they are not merely purchasing hardware. They are committing to KRL programming, KUKA's controller architecture, KUKA's simulation software, KUKA's safety systems, and KUKA's service and support infrastructure. Switching to a different vendor means retraining staff, rewriting programmes, replacing controllers, and potentially redesigning entire cell layouts. The switching costs are enormous, which is exactly the point.

This is not unique to robotics. It is the same dynamic that has shaped the technology industry more broadly, from Microsoft's dominance of desktop computing through proprietary file formats, to Apple's closed hardware ecosystem, to Oracle's database licensing model. In each case, the vendor's commercial interest lies in making it as difficult and expensive as possible for customers to leave. The difference in industrial automation is that this lock in does not merely inconvenience individual consumers. It fragments an entire industrial ecosystem, preventing the kind of systemic integration that would make automation accessible, affordable, and scalable.

4.2 The Layers of Competing Interests

The automation supply chain is not a simple vendor to customer relationship. It is a multi layered structure of competing interests that each extract value at the expense of coherence. At the top sit the robot manufacturers themselves. Below them are the system integrators, companies that specialise in designing and building complete robot cells for end customers. These integrators are themselves locked into vendor relationships, often holding partner certifications with specific robot brands that incentivise them to recommend those brands regardless of whether they are the best technical fit.

Below the integrators sit the component suppliers: the vision system manufacturers, the gripper manufacturers, the safety equipment suppliers, the conveyor system providers. Each of these layers adds its own proprietary interfaces, its own documentation, its own support requirements, and its own commercial incentives to resist standardisation. The end customer, typically an SME manufacturer trying to automate a specific process, sits at the bottom of this pyramid, facing upward at a towering structure of vendor lock in, proprietary interfaces, and misaligned incentives. They lack the technical knowledge to evaluate competing solutions, the bargaining power to demand interoperability, and the capital to absorb the inevitable integration costs. It is no wonder that only 4 percent of UK SMEs have adopted automation.

4.3 The Refusal to Change

Beneath the technical fragmentation lies a deeper political reality: the entrenched private interests that control the automation industry have no incentive to change. Standardisation, interoperability, and open protocols would benefit end users and the broader economy, but they would erode the profit margins of incumbent vendors, integrators, and service providers. The industry's resistance to change is not irrational. It is entirely logical from the perspective of firms whose business models depend on proprietary ecosystems and captive customer bases.

This is why voluntary industry standards, while valuable, are insufficient. The development of standards like VDA 5050 for mobile robot interoperability, the MassRobotics Interoperability Standard, and the forthcoming ISO 21423 are important steps, but they address only a narrow slice of the problem, mobile robots sharing location data, and leave the deeper structural fragmentation, proprietary programming languages, incompatible controllers, closed simulation environments, entirely untouched. There is a well known observation about competing standards: when too many exist, someone proposes a universal one, and the result is simply one more standard. Adding a universal abstraction layer does not eliminate complexity; it redistributes it.

> **The Paradox of Standards**
>
> *The robotics industry now has VDA 5050, Open-RMF, MassRobotics, ISO 21423, and dozens of proprietary APIs. Each was created to solve fragmentation. The cumulative result is more fragmentation.*

5. The China Model: Centralisation as a Solution, and Its Costs

If the market cannot produce coherence on its own, then one solution is to impose it from above through centralised state direction. This is precisely what the People's Republic of China has done, and the results, measured purely in terms of automation deployment, are extraordinary.

5.1 China's Dominance in Numbers

According to the IFR World Robotics 2025 report, China accounted for 54 percent of all global industrial robot installations in 2024. A total of 295,000 robots were deployed, a new national record. China's operational stock of industrial robots surpassed 2 million units, the largest of any country. For the first time, Chinese manufacturers sold more robots domestically than foreign suppliers, with their market share climbing to 57 percent, up from approximately 28 percent over the previous decade.

54%

China's share of all global industrial robot installations in 2024

These figures represent a strategic national programme, directed from the highest levels of central government, to use automation as an engine of industrial modernisation, to reduce dependence on foreign technology, and to counteract the labour force challenges created by demographic decline. China has achieved something that the fragmented Western market has not: technical coherence at national scale. By directing investment, coordinating standards, subsidising domestic manufacturers, and integrating robotics into a broader industrial strategy, the Chinese state has created an ecosystem in which automation is not a luxury for large firms but a standard feature of the manufacturing landscape.

5.2 The Authoritarian Cost

There is, however, a profound cost to this model, and it is a cost that no society genuinely committed to human freedom should be willing to pay. China's automation success is inseparable from its broader political system: a one party state with comprehensive surveillance capabilities, suppression of independent trade unions, systematic erosion of civil liberties, and a governance model in which the population has no meaningful mechanism to challenge, redirect, or constrain the decisions of their rulers.

The same centralised authority that can coordinate a national robotics strategy can also deploy facial recognition technology against its own citizens, operate re education camps, and suppress any form of political dissent. The tools of technological integration, when placed in the hands of an unaccountable state, become tools of control. This is not a hypothetical concern. It is the lived reality of hundreds of millions of people. The historical record, across the twentieth century and into the twenty first, demonstrates repeatedly that concentrated power, however benevolent its stated intentions, tends inevitably towards the abuse of that power. The machinery of the state, once constructed to sufficient capability, will be used by whoever controls it, and the interests of the controllers will inevitably diverge from the interests of the controlled.

5.3 The Western Dilemma

Western nations, and the United Kingdom in particular, thus face a genuine dilemma. The market system produces fragmentation. State centralisation produces coherence but at the cost of freedom. The current policy response, a mixture of tax incentives, innovation hubs, and training programmes, amounts to tinkering at the margins of a structural problem. The UK government's 2025 Industrial Strategy, which includes £4.3 billion for Advanced Manufacturing over five years, is welcome but ultimately insufficient, because it does not address the underlying political economy that produces fragmentation in the first place.

This is compounded by the emergence of other advanced technologies, artificial intelligence, biotechnology, quantum computing, autonomous weapons systems, each of which has profound consequences when controlled by unaccountable power, whether that power takes the form of a pathological state leader or an unregulated corporate monopoly. The question of how to organise industrial automation is therefore not merely an economic question. It is a question about the kind of society we want to live in, about the distribution of power, and about whether we can find a model that achieves technical coherence without sacrificing human autonomy.

> **The Core Dilemma**
>
> *Markets produce fragmentation. States produce centralisation. Neither, on its own, produces both coherence and freedom. A third model is needed.*

6. The Displacement Engine: Automation, AI, and the Erosion of Work

There is a bitter irony at the heart of the automation industry's skills crisis. The very technologies that the industry is struggling to deploy, robots, AI, and advanced manufacturing systems, are simultaneously making millions of existing jobs redundant. The displacement is not a side effect. It is, under the current incentive structure, the entire point.

6.1 The Logic of Labour Replacement

Under the prevailing economic model, the primary incentive for a firm to invest in automation is the reduction of labour costs. A robot does not take sick leave, does not demand a pay rise, does not join a union, and does not require a pension. The return on investment calculation for a robot cell is typically framed in terms of how many human workers it replaces and how quickly the capital expenditure is recovered through reduced wage bills. This is not a moral judgement on individual business owners. It is the structural logic of an economic system in which labour is treated as a cost to be minimised rather than a human capacity to be developed.

Human beings need meaningful work not merely for material survival but for psychological integrity, for a sense of purpose and connection that goes to the core of what it means to live a dignified life. When work is stripped away without replacement, what remains is not leisure but despair. Meaning must be constructed through engagement with the world, but engagement requires agency, and agency requires that people have something to do, something they own, something they have built.

6.2 The AI Acceleration

The displacement pressure is intensifying. Generative AI is now capable of automating cognitive tasks that were previously considered safe from technological disruption: report writing, data analysis, customer service, basic legal work, software development, and creative content production. When combined with physical automation, robotics armed with AI powered vision, decision making, and adaptive behaviour, the scope of potential displacement extends across virtually the entire economy.

The IFR reports that collaborative robot installations grew from 11,100 units in 2017 to 64,500 units in 2024, with their share of total installations rising from 2.8 percent to 11.9 percent. These cobots are specifically designed to work alongside, and increasingly to replace, human workers in tasks that were previously too complex or variable for traditional industrial robots. The no code and low code programming approaches being developed to address the skills shortage are simultaneously lowering

the barrier to deployment, making it easier for firms to automate away jobs without needing the very engineers they claim to be unable to find.

> **Cobot Growth**
>
> *Collaborative robot installations grew from 11,100 units in 2017 to 64,500 in 2024. Their market share rose from 2.8% to 11.9%. These are the machines designed to replace the remaining human tasks.*

6.3 The Insufficiency of Retraining

The standard policy response to technological displacement is retraining: upskill the workforce, create new pathways, and the economy will adjust. This is a comforting narrative, but it is increasingly disconnected from reality. The pace of technological change is outstripping the capacity of educational institutions to adapt their curricula. The vendor specific nature of automation skills means that retraining in one platform does not guarantee employability on another. And the sheer scale of potential displacement, across manufacturing, logistics, retail, administration, and professional services, dwarfs the capacity of any training programme to absorb.

The current trajectory threatens a world in which millions of people are denied the material conditions necessary for a meaningful life, cast adrift without work, without ownership, without community, and told that their redundancy is merely a transitional phase in an inevitable march of progress. The complacent optimism which insists that markets will self correct and displaced workers will find new roles is the most dangerous kind of denial, because it mistakes the deferral of a crisis for its resolution.

7. Beyond Markets and States: The Case for Federated Cooperative Enterprise

If markets produce fragmentation and states produce authoritarianism, then the task is to construct a third model: one that achieves the technical coherence necessary for a functioning automation capability while preserving, indeed deepening, individual autonomy, democratic governance, and community resilience. This is not a utopian fantasy. It is an engineering problem with historical precedents and practical solutions.

7.1 What Is a Federated Cooperative?

A federated cooperative is a network of locally owned, democratically governed enterprises that are linked together through a shared institutional framework. Each cooperative is autonomous in its day to day operations, owned by its worker members, and governed by the principle of one person, one vote. The federation provides shared services, purchasing power, technical standards, training, research and development, and financial support, functions that individual cooperatives could not sustain alone.

The most developed example in the world is the Mondragón Corporation in the Basque region of Spain, a federation of over 80 cooperatives employing approximately 70,000 worker members. Mondragón's model demonstrates that cooperative enterprise can operate at significant industrial scale, compete in global markets, maintain democratic governance, and sustain communities through economic crises. When the cooperative Fagor Electrodoméstico went bankrupt during the financial crisis, 95 percent of its nearly 2,000 workers were relocated within the Mondragón network. The income ratio between the highest and lowest paid workers is capped at 6:1, compared with ratios exceeding 300:1 in conventional corporate structures. Base pay for a Mondragón worker is on average 40 percent higher than Spain's minimum wage.

> **Mondragón in Numbers**
>
> *70,000 worker members across 80+ cooperatives. Over 60 years of continuous operation. Maximum pay ratio of 6:1. 95% of displaced workers successfully relocated during the financial crisis.*

7.2 Why Federation Solves the Coherence Problem

The federated cooperative model is uniquely suited to solving the coherence problem in industrial automation, because it creates a structure in which technical coordination can occur without the centralisation of power. Consider the specific mechanisms.

7.2.1 Collective Purchasing and Economies of Scale

A national federation of automation cooperatives could negotiate directly with robot manufacturers, component suppliers, and software vendors on behalf of all its member cooperatives. This would achieve the economies of scale currently available only to large corporations, driving down hardware costs and making automation accessible to the SMEs that constitute 99 percent of UK manufacturing. Collective purchasing also shifts the balance of power: a federation representing thousands of engineers and dozens of local cooperatives has bargaining leverage that no individual SME possesses. This leverage can be used not merely to reduce prices but to demand interoperability, open interfaces, and standardised protocols, precisely the things that the market's current incentive structure prevents.

7.2.2 Shared Software Platforms and Knowledge Exchange

Within a federated cooperative, there is no commercial incentive for proprietary lock in. If one cooperative develops a software tool, a vision system calibration routine, a robot programme template, a safety assessment methodology, that tool can be shared across the entire federation at zero marginal cost. This eliminates the wasteful duplication that currently characterises the industry, where hundreds of integrators independently solve the same problems, write the same code, and fight the same integration battles, each time from scratch, because proprietary silos prevent knowledge from flowing.

A federation could maintain a shared internal platform, a commons of engineering knowledge, programme libraries, training materials, system designs, and best practices, that grows richer with every project and is accessible to every member. This is the technical coherence that the market cannot produce, achieved not through top down mandate but through voluntary mutual cooperation. The natural human tendency towards collaboration, when institutional structures are designed to enable rather than prevent it, is one of the most powerful forces available to any organisation. A cooperative federation channels that force deliberately.

7.2.3 Standardised Training and Career Pathways

A federation could develop and maintain standardised training curricula, grounded in the real engineering practices used across its member cooperatives, that provide clear, structured pathways into the industry. Instead of the current chaos, where a young person must guess which vendor to specialise in and hope they guess correctly, a federation could offer a common foundational training in systems integration, safety engineering, and automation principles, followed by specialised modules that reflect the federation's actual technical stack.

This is not merely a training programme. It is an institutional solution to the skills crisis. Apprentices and students could begin at a local cooperative close to their home, build skills and knowledge within a supportive community, contribute to real projects from an early stage, and know that their training would be recognised and valued across the entire federation. They would not be disposable labour, cycling through temporary contracts with no accumulation of ownership or security. They would be on a pathway to membership, to co ownership of the enterprise, to a stake in their own working lives.

8. Ownership, Dignity, and Community: The Human Case for Cooperative Automation

The case for federated cooperative enterprise in industrial automation is not solely, or even primarily, a technical or economic argument. It is a human argument, grounded in the conviction that working people deserve ownership, dignity, and community, and that the current trajectory of the automation industry is actively destroying all three.

8.1 Ownership in an Age of Displacement

As conventional corporations race to replace their employees with automated systems, the workers being displaced have no recourse, no stake in the enterprise that has discarded them, and no claim on the wealth generated by the machines that took their jobs. They are, in the most literal sense, redundant, a word whose cold efficiency perfectly captures the dehumanisation at the heart of the process.

A cooperative model inverts this dynamic. Worker members are not employees who can be made redundant. They are co owners of the enterprise. The automation systems they build, programme, and maintain are tools that they collectively own and from which they collectively benefit. If a cooperative adopts a new technology that changes the nature of the work, the affected members have a democratic voice in how that transition is managed, whether through retraining, redeployment within the federation, or a negotiated reduction in working hours with maintained income.

8.2 Dignity Through Contribution

Human dignity is inseparable from the capacity to contribute meaningfully to the life of one's community. An economy which treats its workers as disposable inputs is an economy that produces not prosperity but humiliation. A federated cooperative in industrial automation would provide precisely the kind of meaningful contribution that dignifies work. Members would not be cogs in a machine, executing tasks defined by distant shareholders for profit they will never share. They would be engineers, technicians, programmers, and designers who own the enterprise, shape its direction, and benefit from its success. They would be building something that belongs to them and to their community.

8.3 Community as Infrastructure

The erosion of community in post industrial Britain is not an accident. It is the predictable consequence of an economic model that treats places as interchangeable locations and people as mobile labour

inputs. When a factory closes, the community that depended on it does not simply "adjust." It deteriorates. Local businesses lose customers. Schools lose families. Social networks fray. The material foundation of community life, the shared workplace, the common purpose, the mutual reliance, is stripped away, and nothing replaces it.

A network of local automation cooperatives, federated at national scale but rooted in specific places, would reverse this dynamic. Each cooperative would be an anchor institution in its community, providing skilled employment, training opportunities, and a democratic space in which local people have a genuine stake. The cooperative would not relocate its operations to a cheaper jurisdiction, because its members live in the community and their interests are aligned with its flourishing.

Game theory demonstrates that rational actors in competitive systems frequently reach outcomes that are suboptimal for all participants, trapped in equilibria that serve no one's long term interests. The current structure of the UK automation industry is precisely such a trap: fragmented, underperforming, and unable to coordinate its way out because the competitive incentives prevent cooperation. A federated cooperative structure changes the game itself, aligning individual incentives with collective outcomes by making every worker a stakeholder in the shared enterprise.

9. A Structural Proposal: The National Automation Cooperative Federation

What follows is not a policy wish list but a structural blueprint for a National Automation Cooperative Federation (NACF), designed to be practically implementable within the existing legal, financial, and industrial frameworks of the United Kingdom.

9.1 Architecture of the Federation

The NACF would consist of three interlocking layers. The first layer would be the local cooperatives, each rooted in a specific geographic area, each owned and governed by its worker members, and each focused on delivering automation services, system integration, robot programming, commissioning, maintenance, training, and consultancy, to manufacturers in their region. The ideal initial network would establish cooperatives in areas with existing manufacturing concentrations: the Midlands, the North West, the North East, Yorkshire, South Wales, Central Scotland, and the South West.

The second layer would be the sectoral divisions, grouping cooperatives by specialisation, for example, automotive, food and beverage, pharmaceuticals, aerospace, general manufacturing, and emerging sectors like construction and laboratory automation, in order to develop deep domain expertise and share sector specific knowledge. The third layer would be the federation itself, governed by an elected congress of delegates from all member cooperatives, responsible for shared services, collective purchasing, the internal software platform, the training curriculum, research and development, and financial solidarity mechanisms.

9.2 Technical Coherence Through Federation

The federation would maintain a shared technical platform, a curated repository of robot programmes, vision system configurations, safety assessment templates, PLC code libraries, simulation models, and integration best practices. This platform would be the intellectual commons of the federation, freely accessible to all members and continuously enriched by the engineering work of every cooperative. Critically, this platform would not mandate a single vendor or technology stack. It would instead provide abstraction layers, integration tools, and documentation that enable engineers to work across multiple platforms without starting from scratch on every project.

The federation would also negotiate directly with hardware vendors, using its collective purchasing power to demand open interfaces, standardised data formats, and competitive pricing. Where vendors refuse to provide adequate interoperability, the federation would invest in developing open

source middleware and translation layers, drawing on the precedent set by ROS Industrial, the open source framework that already enables different brands of robots to share information regardless of manufacturer.

9.3 Entry Pathways: From School to Ownership

The NACF would provide structured entry pathways at multiple levels. School engagement programmes would introduce young people to automation through practical workshops and site visits at their local cooperative. Apprenticeships would offer paid, structured training within the cooperative, combining hands on project work with formal education, leading to recognised qualifications and, ultimately, membership. University partnerships would provide cooperative placements, research collaborations, and a direct pipeline from engineering degrees into cooperative employment.

Critically, the NACF would also provide retraining and transition pathways for workers displaced from other industries. A logistics worker made redundant by warehouse automation, a factory operative replaced by a robot cell, a clerical worker displaced by AI, each could enter the cooperative training programme, build new skills in the very technologies that displaced them, and emerge not as a disposable employee of a corporation that will eventually automate them too, but as a co owner of a democratically governed enterprise with a long term stake in their own economic future.

9.4 Financial Architecture

Following the Mondragón model, the NACF would include a cooperative financial institution, a credit union or mutual bank, that pools member capital and provides investment finance to member cooperatives. Each new member would make an initial capital contribution, financed if necessary through payroll deduction over time, giving them a genuine ownership stake. Profits generated by each cooperative would be distributed according to a formula: a portion retained for reinvestment, a portion allocated to members' capital accounts, a portion contributed to the federation's solidarity fund, and a portion directed to community benefit.

The solidarity fund is essential. It provides the financial mechanism for inter cooperative support, ensuring that temporary downturns in one cooperative do not result in layoffs but are absorbed across the federation. This mechanism, proven over six decades at Mondragón, provides a level of economic resilience that no conventional business structure can match.

9.5 Democratic Governance: Power Without Centralisation

The NACF's governance structure would embody the principle of subsidiarity: decisions made at the lowest level at which they can be effectively made. Day to day operational decisions would rest with each cooperative's members. Sectoral strategy would be set by the sectoral divisions. Federation wide policies, concerning shared platforms, purchasing agreements, training standards, and solidarity mechanisms, would be determined by the elected congress.

This is not centralisation. It is coordination, the free agreement of autonomous groups united by common purpose. Power flows upward from the membership and can be withdrawn. No individual, no committee, and no executive can override the democratic will of the member cooperatives. This structure achieves the scale necessary to compete with large corporations and the coherence necessary for effective automation, while maintaining the democratic accountability that prevents the concentration and abuse of power.

> **Power Distribution**
>
> *A cooperative federation is not a hierarchy. It is a network of autonomous nodes, connected by shared purpose and mutual agreement, where power flows upward from the membership and can be withdrawn at any time.*

10. Leverage Against Tyranny: Cooperatives as Democratic Infrastructure

There is a dimension to this proposal that extends beyond economics and industrial policy, into the realm of democratic resilience. In an era of rising authoritarianism, eroding democratic norms, and the increasing concentration of technological power in the hands of states and corporations, federated cooperative enterprises provide something that no other institutional form can: distributed, resilient, democratically governed economic power that is structurally resistant to capture by authoritarian actors.

10.1 Technology in the Wrong Hands

The advanced technologies emerging in this century, artificial intelligence, autonomous systems, surveillance networks, biotechnology, quantum computing, have profound consequences when controlled by unaccountable power. History provides ample evidence, and the twentieth century in particular is saturated with it, that concentrated power, whether in the form of totalitarian states or unchecked corporate monopolies, will use every available tool to maintain and extend its control. The concentration of economic power inevitably leads to the concentration of political power, and the only safeguard against tyranny is the distribution of both.

10.2 Cooperatives as Countervailing Power

A national network of worker owned automation cooperatives would constitute a significant base of countervailing power. Thousands of skilled engineers and technicians, democratically organised, collectively owning significant industrial assets, and embedded in communities across the country, would represent a constituency that no government could easily ignore or suppress. Unlike individual employees, who can be fired, or individual businesses, who can be regulated into compliance or driven into bankruptcy, a federation of cooperatives has institutional resilience: the capacity to absorb shocks, to support its members through adversity, and to maintain its democratic character under pressure.

In a world where advanced technology is increasingly capable of being weaponised against populations, the existence of strong, autonomous, worker controlled economic institutions is not a luxury. It is a necessity. Cooperatives do not merely produce goods and services. They produce citizens, people with the skills, the stake, and the institutional support to participate meaningfully in democratic life.

11. Objections and Responses

11.1 "Cooperatives Cannot Compete at Scale"

This objection is refuted by the existence of Mondragón, which operates 80+ cooperatives, employs 70,000 worker members, competes in global markets, and has sustained itself for over sixty years. The federation structure specifically addresses the scale challenge by providing shared services, purchasing power, and institutional support that individual small cooperatives could not sustain. In the Mondragón context, "large is beautiful" because large makes it possible to compete in global markets while maximising employment.

11.2 "The UK Has No Cooperative Culture"

The United Kingdom has a rich cooperative history, from the Rochdale Pioneers of 1844 to the present day cooperative economy, which includes the Co op Group, numerous housing cooperatives, credit unions, and worker owned businesses. The UK cooperative sector generates over £40 billion annually. What has been lacking is not cultural affinity for cooperation but institutional support and policy frameworks that actively encourage cooperative formation in advanced industrial sectors. The Basque Country did not have a "cooperative culture" before Arizmendiarrieta founded his polytechnic school in 1943. Culture is not given. It is built, deliberately and patiently, through institutions.

11.3 "This Is Politically Unrealistic"

The construction of a federated automation cooperative does not require a revolution, a change of government, or a new legislative framework. It requires a group of experienced automation professionals to incorporate a cooperative, begin trading, demonstrate the model's viability, and attract others to join. The legal structures for cooperative incorporation already exist in UK law. The financial mechanisms, from community shares to credit unions, are well established. What is required is the will to begin, and the patience to build.

Moreover, the political landscape is shifting. The failures of privatisation, deregulation, and market fundamentalism are increasingly evident across the economy. There is growing public appetite for alternative economic models, and cooperative enterprise is one of the very few alternatives that has a proven track record at scale.

11.4 "Technology Moves Too Fast for Democratic Governance"

This objection confuses speed with competence. Democratic governance does not mean that every technical decision is put to a vote. It means that the strategic direction of the enterprise, its values, its investment priorities, and its relationship with its community, are determined by the people who do the work. Operational decisions, which programming language to use on a given project, which safety relay to specify, how to calibrate a vision system, remain the province of technical expertise. The Mondragón model handles this distinction effectively, balancing democratic control at the strategic level with managerial discretion at the operational level, and it operates in sectors, including advanced manufacturing and machine tool production, that require exactly the kind of technical agility the objection claims cooperatives cannot sustain.

12. Conclusion: Build the Structure, Build the Future

The UK's industrial automation sector is stagnating. The evidence is clear, the numbers are damning, and the trajectory, relative to international competitors, is one of accelerating decline. The skills shortage is real. The fragmentation is real. The displacement of workers by the very technologies the industry produces is real. And the solutions currently on offer, more funding, more training, more innovation hubs, are inadequate because they do not address the structural causes of the crisis.

The structural cause is political. Industry is organised around competing private interests whose commercial incentives actively produce the fragmentation that prevents technical coherence. The market cannot fix what the market creates. State centralisation can impose coherence but at the cost of freedom, as China's model demonstrates with both its impressive automation statistics and its comprehensive authoritarianism.

The solution is a third model: federated cooperative enterprise, operating at national scale, democratically governed, collectively owned, and structurally designed to produce both technical coherence and human dignity. Such a federation would democratise access to hardware through collective purchasing power, eliminate wasteful duplication through shared software platforms, create accessible career pathways from school to ownership, provide displaced workers with a route into the very industry that displaced them, anchor economic activity in communities, distribute power rather than concentrating it, and provide working people with leverage against potentially tyrannical states.

This is not utopian. It is practical, precedented, and urgently necessary. The Mondragón cooperatives have demonstrated the model's viability for sixty years. The UK's cooperative legal infrastructure already exists. The technology exists. The need is overwhelming. What is required is the decision to begin.

José María Arizmendiarrieta, the founder of Mondragón, wrote: "Nothing differentiates people as much as their respective attitudes to the circumstances in which they live. Those who opt to make history and change the course of events themselves have an advantage over those who decide to wait passively for the results of the change."

The circumstances are clear. The choice is ours.

Glossary of Key Terms

Term	Definition
AMR	Autonomous Mobile Robot. A robot that navigates independently using sensors and software, without fixed tracks or guides.
Cobot	Collaborative Robot. A robot designed to work alongside human operators, typically with built in safety features that limit force and speed.
ERP	Enterprise Resource Planning. Integrated software systems used by organisations to manage business processes.
Federated Cooperative	A network of locally autonomous, democratically governed cooperatives linked by shared services, standards, and solidarity mechanisms.
Fieldbus	An industrial network protocol used for real time distributed control, connecting sensors, actuators, and controllers.
HMI	Human Machine Interface. The control panel or screen through which operators interact with automated systems.
IFR	International Federation of Robotics. The global industry body that publishes annual World Robotics statistics.
ISO 10218	The international safety standard governing industrial robot systems and integration.
ISO 13849	The international standard for safety related parts of control systems.
ISO 21423	The forthcoming international standard for industrial mobile robot interoperability.
KRL	KUKA Robot Language. The proprietary programming language used by KUKA industrial robots.
NACF	National Automation Cooperative Federation. The proposed federated cooperative structure outlined in this document.
PLC	Programmable Logic Controller. An industrial computer used to control manufacturing processes.
RAPID	The proprietary programming language used by ABB industrial robots.
Robot Density	The number of industrial robots per 10,000 manufacturing workers, used as a measure of automation adoption.
ROS / ROS 2	Robot Operating System. An open source middleware framework for robot software development.

SME	Small and Medium sized Enterprise. In the UK context, businesses with fewer than 250 employees.
System Integrator	A company that designs, builds, and commissions complete automation systems for end customers.
VDA 5050	A European standard for communication between autonomous mobile robots and fleet management systems.
Worker Cooperative	A business owned and democratically governed by its workers, operating on the principle of one person, one vote.

Quick Reference Notes

1	UK robot density is approximately 112 per 10,000 workers, the lowest in the G7 and roughly half the EU average.
2	UK robot installations fell 35% in 2024 to 2,500 units. The UK ranks 19th globally.
3	China installed 295,000 robots in 2024, accounting for 54% of global deployments. Its operational stock exceeds 2 million.
4	Globally, 4.66 million industrial robots are in operational use, a 9% year on year increase.
5	99% of UK manufacturing businesses are SMEs. Only 4% of SMEs have adopted automation.
6	70,000 vacancies exist in UK manufacturing. Nearly half of manufacturers cite skills shortages as the primary barrier.
7	Cobot installations grew from 11,100 in 2017 to 64,500 in 2024, a share increase from 2.8% to 11.9%.
8	The Mondragón Corporation employs 70,000 worker members across 80+ cooperatives with a 6:1 maximum pay ratio.
9	Matching global automation standards could add £150 billion to the UK economy by 2035.
10	The UK fell from 10th to 19th on the Competitive Industrial Performance Index between 2005 and 2023.
11	61% of companies globally cite lack of automation experience as a barrier (McKinsey).
12	British workers have 47% less access to machinery and technology than counterparts in comparable economies.
13	ISO 21423, the forthcoming mobile robot interoperability standard, has nearly 90 contributors from around the world.

14 The UK government's 2025 Industrial Strategy includes £4.3 billion for Advanced Manufacturing over five years.

15 South Korea leads globally with 1,012 robots per 10,000 workers, compared to the UK's 112.

Sources and Further Reading

International Federation of Robotics (IFR), World Robotics 2025 Report, September 2025.

Make UK and Siemens, "Making it Smarter: Global Lessons for Accelerating Automation and Digital Adoption in UK Manufacturing," 2025.

The National Robotarium, "Why 2025's Industrial Strategy Must Close Britain's Manufacturing Robotics Gap," December 2024.

House of Commons Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy Committee, "Automation and the Future of Work," 2019.

ARIA, "The Future of Robotics Modularity and Interoperability," August 2025.

MTC / Innovate UK, "Workforce Foresighting for Robotics and Automation in the Metalworking Sector," March 2025.

HM Government, "Invest 2035: The UK's Modern Industrial Strategy," October 2025.

Mondragón Corporation, Annual Reports and Cooperative Principles documentation.

Jill Bamburg, "Mondragón Through a Critical Lens: Ten Lessons from a Visit to the Basque Cooperative Confederation."

David Morris, "The Mondragón System: Cooperation at Work," Institute for Local Self Reliance, 1992.

Richard D. Wolff, "Democracy at Work: A Cure for Capitalism," Haymarket Books, 2012.

ISO/TC 299, Working Group 10, ISO 21423 Draft International Standard for Industrial Mobile Robot Interoperability.

IndexBox, "UK Manufacturing Automation Lag: Robotic Investment vs. National Decline," April 2026.