the need for the recognition of self-interest rights, since those are off-set by the benefits derived from the network. Network relationships need not be based on equality. Hierarchical structures are thus more accepted in a communitarian society. This creates less of a concern with dominance itself, so long as the dominance does not lead to "unfair" extractions.

● Communitarian top dogs

A well-functioning communitarian system would permit individuals and firms to join or exit relationship-based networks. Entry and exit is likely to be a protracted process. An efficient network would have some critical membership mass. A progressive communitarian society would experience the demise of old, inefficient networks and the formation of new relationship-based networks to respond to changed circumstances. A successful network would be able to adapt to the requirements of its members and flourish in the long-term. In general, we would expect communitarianism to exhibit competition among networks based on relationships. However, networks can subvert common good and freedom in a communitarian society. Consider the following examples.

First, it is possible that relationships themselves may grow to such a strength that they prevent other relationships from forming with them. As this would militate against the continued growth of the community, a communitarian society will punish excessive dominance only so far as it threatens fundamentally to weaken society's capacity to develop relationships.

Second, in its pursuit for growth a network may carve out a dominant position for its group in the community. As long as the dominant group is open to new members and does not abuse its position in the community and market, the dominant group does not impede the efficiency, harmony and progress in the community. However, if one dominant group uses its position to gain unfair advantage over people and firms in other smaller networks, it will adversely affect community welfare.

Third, some networks could combine themselves in a cartel-like arrangement vis-à-vis others in the community. Consequently, social welfare of companies and individuals outside the cartels would be adversely affected. In such a situation, it would become important that the freedom of adversely